Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

in memoriam

REV. CHARLES V. TRENT

presented by

MRS. CHARLES V. TRENT

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

Henry B. Bondurant
709 Safford.
Garden City, Kans.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/manualofbaptisjm0000gsba

A

MANUAL OF BAPTISM.

BY

G. S. BAILEY.

PHILADELPHIA:
AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
No. 1420 CHESTNUT STREET.

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY, KANSAS 66102

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1868, by the

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States, in and for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

J. FAGAN & SON,

STEREOTYPE FOUNDERS, PHILADELPHIA.

154

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

Baptism a Duty 7

CHAPTER II.

Denominational Differences 14

CHAPTER III.

Dr. Rice's General Argument Refuted 18

CHAPTER IV.

Pedobaptist Fallacies 31

CHAPTER V.

Greek Lexicons 36

CHAPTER VI.

Other Learned Lexicons and Witnesses 45

68107

CHAPTER VII.

PAGE

Classical Use of Baptizo 61

CHAPTER VIII.

Sacred Sense of Baptizo 79

CHAPTER IX.

Use of Baptizo in the Septuagint 85

CHAPTER X.

Josephus and the Early Christian Writers 104

CHAPTER XI.

Translations of the Bible 121

CHAPTER XII.

Baptizo cannot mean to Sprinkle, Pour, or Purify 132

CHAPTER XIII.

Historical Evidence 141

CHAPTER XIV.

John's Baptism 159

CHAPTER XV.

How was Jesus Baptized? 186

CHAPTER XVI.

PAGE

Buried in Baptism..... 198

CHAPTER XVII.

Baptism of the Holy Ghost and of Fire..... 220

CHAPTER XVIII.

Baptism of Suffering..... 231

CHAPTER XIX.

Baptism of the Israelites unto Moses..... 236

CHAPTER XX.

Baptism on the Day of Pentecost..... 241

CHAPTER XXI.

Baptism of the Eunuch..... 266

CHAPTER XXII.

Baptism of Paul, Cornelius, and the Jailor..... 274

CHAPTER XXIII.

Baptism of Cups, Tables, etc..... 286

CHAPTER XXIV.

One Baptism—Spirit, Water, and Blood—Ark..... 292

CHAPTER XXV.

PAGE
Origin of Pouring and Sprinkling 305

CHAPTER XXVI.

Recapitulation—Reasons for Immersion 327

A

MANUAL OF BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

BAPTISM A DUTY.

Unlike all others — Performed at an important period — In the name of the Trinity — Commanded by the Bible — Should be kept as delivered by inspired teachers — Extremes should be avoided — Not a saving ordinance — Unjust accusations — The "spiritual" plea for neglecting baptism — Not a question of modes — Dr. Rice on Baptism.

BAPTISM is unlike all other religious duties in this one respect — it needs to be performed but once in a whole lifetime, if it is rightly done. A duty which God has expressly commanded, and which needs to be performed but once, surely ought to be done rightly, so that no doubts of having obeyed that command could ever arise to harrass the mind or distress the conscience. Especially what is done at the time of our public profession of religion, when we renounce the world and sin, and give ourselves forever to the service of Christ, ought to be properly

done. And more especially what is done in the sacred, loved, and awful name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, should be done in strict accordance with the Lord's command. If it were to be observed by us repeatedly, it might possibly be said to deserve less attention. But as a single act of obedience to God, expressly commanded by him, and to be observed but once, and then at the most momentous period in our history, when we publicly profess Christ before the world; and also to be done in the name of the Holy Trinity, it is worthy of prayerful consideration.

Jesus said, "Preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them." Peter, on the day of Pentecost, exhorted the people to repent and be baptized. Peter commanded the believing centurion to be baptized. If the apostles were now preaching, and you were converted under their ministry, they would tell you that it is your duty to be baptized.

If it is your duty to keep the command at all, it is your duty to keep it as it was delivered by the inspired teachers. It is your duty to do the thing which God has commanded. We may not substitute something else in place of God's command. "Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things and keep the ordinances as I delivered them to you." 1 Cor. xi. 2. "Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition?" Matt.

xv. 3. "In vain they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Matt. xv. 9.

Two opposite and extreme views are held in regard to baptism, both of which are erroneous, and should be avoided. One view regards it as the means of regeneration, forgiveness and salvation; the other regards it as unimportant; an ordinance to be observed or not, as each individual may choose. The former makes it a saving ordinance; the latter says, because it is not essential to salvation, therefore it is a mere outward ceremony which deserves no attention. Some Pedobaptist ministers in my own acquaintance have publicly announced that they would receive members into their churches without any baptism at all. These would set aside the command of God entirely.

Baptists are sometimes accused of making too much of baptism. We are sometimes asked—"Do you regard it as a saving ordinance?" Certainly not. The Baptists are the least liable to such a charge of any people in the world. For it is our invariable rule never to baptize a candidate until we have credible evidence that he is already regenerated and saved. Hence the absolute impossibility of our regarding it as a saving ordinance. If we administered the ordinance to unconscious infants, and to mere anxious inquirers, it would look much more like making it a saving ordinance.

Very extravagant and unfounded assertions are made concerning us by those who oppose our views

of baptism. Take the following as a sample. It is from "Fairchild on Baptism," a recent work issued by the Presbyterian Board of Publication in Philadelphia:—

"They" (the Baptists) "lay very great stress on immersion, and seek every occasion to magnify its importance. Immersion is the most prominent topic in their public discourses, as it is the chief burden of their tracts, books, and newspaper publications." "On the whole, taking the most charitable view which the case will admit, we cannot doubt that the position assumed by our Baptist brethren is attended with immense mischief. Among the many thousands who listen to their instructions may there not be multitudes who receive the impression that immersion is the great essential to salvation — the safest passport to heaven?" Pages 12, 13.

On reading this passage we cannot but exclaim, Is it possible that a Presbyterian Doctor of Divinity can write such declarations? Is it possible that a grave Board of Publication can approve and send them forth to an enlightened nation which contains more than a million of Baptist church members? Does he not know that we never baptize a person until we believe he is already converted, regenerated and saved? Is he writing against the views of his Baptist brethren while he is so profoundly ignorant of what their views and teachings are? Is there a people in the land who preach more fully than the Baptists the great doctrines of spiritual regeneration,

salvation by grace, justification by faith, and require clearer evidence that those whom they baptize are already in possession of these blessings?

Is "immersion the most prominent topic in their public discourses?" I have never discovered it. I have attended Baptist meetings from my childhood. I cannot recollect ever to have heard a sermon on baptism from a Baptist minister during the period of my youth. I had been an ordained Baptist minister half-a-dozen years when for the first time in my life I heard a Baptist minister preach on baptism. And within the field of my observation during the sixteen years of my ministry, it is indisputably true that Pedobaptists have preached on baptism twice as often as Baptists. I would commend to Dr. Fairchild, and to the Board which endorses and publishes such statements, the commandment, —"Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

But, says one, "if we only have the spiritual part of religion, what need we care for rites and ordinances?" I reply, is it not the most Spiritual Being in the universe that has given the command to be baptized? Had he not the highest and wisest regard for the spiritual welfare of those on whom he enjoined this duty? He who best understands all things in regard to religion, who knows what is best for us both for time and for eternity, and who appreciates most fully our spiritual interests, is the very One who has enjoined on believers the duty

of baptism. Jesus says, "If ye love me, keep my commandments." John xiv. 15. And "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." John xv. 14.

I propose to inquire — What is the baptism enjoined by the Lord Jesus Christ? It is not a question of mere modes and forms. I care as little as any one about mere modes. But the question is— What is and what is not baptism? What did the Saviour mean by the word baptize? What is the duty enjoined? What is and what is not obedience to that command? Is immersion the duty enjoined by the word baptize? or are sprinkling, pouring, and laying the wet fingers on the head of a candidate, equally commanded, and do sprinkling, pouring, and laying on the wet fingers obey the command? These questions surely can be settled by a candid, thorough, and prayerful investigation.

In pursuing these inquiries I shall notice the strongest arguments which have been urged by the advocates of pouring and sprinkling, especially the more recent works of the ablest Pedobaptist writers on the subject. Their latest publications of course contain what are now considered the best arguments on the question. The work of Rev. N. L. Rice, D. D., has of late been more frequently quoted than any other by the advocates of sprinkling, especially in the Western States. Dr. Rice has probably given more attention to the subject than any other Pedobaptist in America. He is a prominent

Doctor of Divinity in the Presbyterian Church. In 1843 he discussed the question with Alexander Campbell, at Lexington, Kentucky, and the debate was fully reported and published. In 1855 he published a separate treatise on Baptism. He has therefore given to the subject mature deliberation. If his arguments are easily refuted, we may be sure it is on account of the weakness of the cause he advocates, and not for the lack of talents on his part, or any want of skill and tact in using all the resources at his command. His works on Baptism will receive some attention here.

CHAPTER II.

DENOMINATIONAL DIFFERENCES.

Our views stated—All churches acknowledge immersion as valid baptism—Christian union desirable—Separation not the fault of Baptists—The journey—The three bills—A good conscience worth more than money.

Our view is that baptism is the immersion of a true believer, in water, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Will any religious denomination deny that the immersion of a believer, in water, in the name of the Trinity, is scriptural baptism? Every denomination of Christians, if they believe in water baptism at all, will acknowledge that this is baptism. None doubt its validity. If we can all agree as to the validity of this one baptism, why should not all practice it, and henceforth our controversies cease upon this point? The Christian world is not agreed upon any other so-called mode of baptism. Many persons in Methodist, Presbyterian and Congregational churches demand immersion. Immersion, too, satisfies the conscience of all who receive it. They never have doubts as to its validity, and never desire to be sprinkled or "poured" subsequently,

while thousands of those who have been sprinkled or "poured" live with troubled consciences all their days, or have to come out from former associations and be immersed, to satisfy their sense of duty and comply with the plain teachings of God's word. About one-third of all the persons I have ever baptized have been previously sprinkled. If a like proportion of the candidates who are baptized by Baptists, have been previously sprinkled, then there must now be some three or four hundred thousand of the present members of Baptist churches in the United States who were once sprinkled, but have renounced it as an error.

Christian union is certainly desirable, and it is important, therefore, that on matters wherein we do agree we should be united in practice. All admit the validity of immersion, but some do not practice it. The fault of separation, then, surely does not belong to the Baptists, who practice the only mode of baptism upon the validity of which all can agree. The fault of division and schism surely belongs to those who depart from the one baptism on which we can all unite.

A company of emigrants start for California. It is desirable that they should travel in company for mutual convenience, enjoyment, economy and safety. All things go well with them, until they reach the uninhabited plains toward the Rocky Mountains, where there appear other roads diverging from the one they are traveling. A dispute arises as to the

best road. A large part of the company believe that the road straight ahead is the only one that leads to California. Others believe not only that the road straight ahead, but also the one leading to the right, and the other one leading to the left, all lead directly to California, and they regard it as a matter of indifference which one they take, except that they have some preference for one of the by-roads, because it seems much traveled and easier. Yet all can agree upon the one road, as being certainly right. Now, if a part of the company take the by-roads, against the earnest protest and entreaty of the others, can they with propriety complain of those who kept the direct road, the only road which the whole company acknowledged to be right? What would you think of those travelers in the by-ways who should exclaim against those in the direct road, "bigotry! selfishness! illiberality! sticklers for mere ways and forms!" You could not resist the conviction that these complainers were themselves totally and alone to blame for the division. Yet what multitudes bitterly complain of the Baptists for practicing that baptism which the whole world acknowledge to be valid, and in which the whole world can unite, if they will, without the sacrifice of any point of conscience!

A neighbor owes you ten dollars. He comes to pay you, and presents three ten dollar bills, and requests you to take your choice. You examine them, and think, possibly, they are all good as the gold.

But a cashier of a bank stands by your side and says to you, "Two of those bills are worthless. One is a counterfeit and the other is on a broken bank. But the third bill is good. I will give you the gold for it, if you wish." Others are standing by; some are good judges of money, and various opinions are passed. Some think all of them may be equally good, others condemn one, and some two of the bills. But all agree that one particular bill out of the three is certainly good. Which one would you be likely to take in payment of the debt? You could not hesitate a moment. Now, in your duty to God, can you hesitate what to accept for baptism? Where ten dollars was at stake, you would decide which bill to take. When a good conscience before God for the right performance of this ordinance is at stake, can you hesitate what to do?

CHAPTER III.

DR. RICE'S GENERAL ARGUMENT REFUTED.

Argument stated—Its general fallacy—Strange logic—False premises—Mosheim, Venema, Knapp, Giesler—Cyprian and Council of Neo-Cæsarea—Valesius—Baronius—Prof. Stuart—The Greek Church—Edinburgh Encyclopedia—Sprinkling introduced into Scotland and England—Increase of Baptists under freedom of speech and general reading of the Bible in this country—Baptists in Pedobaptist Churches—Dr. Rice's two conclusions—Our views of Pedobaptist Churches and ministers.

HAVING noticed the foregoing points, I now invite attention to Dr. Rice's General Argument. "I now state a general argument, which is of great weight against your doctrine, that immersion is the only Christian baptism, viz.: The whole Christian world, in all ages, so far as history can inform us, with the exception of a mere handful, stand arrayed against you. Either they or you have misunderstood the language of Jesus Christ." *Rice on Baptism*, p. 39.

Now, this "general argument of great weight" which Dr. Rice urges, even if the premises were true, which I shall soon disprove, simply amounts to this: The majority of professed Christians in all ages of the world have not believed that immersion

was the only scriptural baptism, therefore it is not the only scriptural baptism. This argument of majorities is a very unsafe one to follow. By it paganism could prove its correctness against Christianity, for pagans are in a large majority. By the same argument popery can refute protestantism, for the Papists have the majority. By it Dr. Rice would annihilate Presbyterianism, for "the whole Christian world, in all ages, with the exception of a mere handful," have not believed in the Presbyterian form of Church government. Therefore it must be unscriptural.

Is this learned author driven to the use of such arguments at the very commencement of his reasoning upon this subject; an argument which if carried out would annihilate his own Church, annihilate protestantism and even Christianity itself? If so, we may expect some strange developments of logic before he finishes his treatise.

But the premises of his "argument of great weight" are not true, as I shall abundantly prove by Pedobaptist writers themselves. It is not true that "The whole Christian world, in all ages, so far as history can inform us, with the exception of a mere handful, stand arrayed against" the doctrine that immersion is the only scriptural baptism.

Mosheim, in his Ecclesiastical History, speaking of John the Baptist, says, "Those who had formed the resolution of correcting their evil dispositions, and amending their lives, were initiated into the king-

dom of the Redeemer by the ceremony of immersion or baptism." Vol. i. Harper's edition, p. 25. Again, "The sacrament of baptism was administered in this (the first) century without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by an immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font." Vol. i. p. 46. Again, speaking of the second century, he says, "The persons that were to be baptized, after they had repeated the Creed, confessed and renounced their sins, and particularly the devil and all his pompous allurements, were immersed under water, and received into Christ's kingdom by a solemn invocation of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, according to the express command of the blessed Lord." Vol. i. p. 69.

Surely this account of the administration of the ordinance by the primitive Christians, and during the first and second centuries, exactly accords with the views of Baptists. In fact, it shows that the primitive Christians were Baptists. Did not *they* understand the meaning of the word *baptize*? They who received the ordinance from John the Baptist, and from the apostles, surely knew what the Saviour commanded. Dr. Mosheim was the Chancellor of the University of Gottingen in 1755. Though himself a Pedobaptist, he makes no allusion to any sprinkling or pouring for baptism among the primitive Christians, or during the first or second centuries. He also speaks of baptism in the third and fourth centuries, but makes no allusion to sprinkling

or pouring, for the simple reason that they were not practiced in the first two centuries, very rarely in the third and fourth, and even then they were not regarded as scriptural. Hear also the testimony of

VENEMA. "It is without controversy, that baptism in the primitive church was administered by immersion into water, and *not by sprinkling.* The essential act of baptizing, in the second century, consisted, not in sprinkling, but in immersion into water, in the name of each person in the Trinity. Concerning immersion, the words and phrases that are used sufficiently testify; and that it was performed in a river, pool or a fountain. To the essential rite of baptism, in the third century, pertained immersion, and not aspersion, except in cases of necessity, and it was accounted a *half-perfect baptism.* Immersion, in the fourth century, was one of those acts that were considered as essential to baptism: nevertheless, aspersion was used in the last moments of life, on such as were clinics,—and also where there was not a sufficient quantity of water." Hist. Eccles. Secul. i. § 138; Secul. ii. § 100; Secul. iii. § 51; Secul. iv. § 110. Quoted in *R. Fuller on Bap.* p. 80.

This testimony is most explicit. Immersion alone was regarded as scriptural baptism in the first two centuries of the Christian era. Subsequently, when men began to view baptism as necessary to salvation, in the third and fourth centuries, in cases of necessity, they substituted sprinkling; but that was

regarded as only a half-perfect baptism, an unscriptural one.

To the same things also testifies Dr. Geo. C. Knapp, in his Theology, translated by Leonard Woods, Jr., of Andover, vol. ii. p. 516; quoted on p. 51 of this book.

So GIESELER'S CHURCH HISTORY. "For the sake of the sick, the rite of sprinkling *was introduced.*" Ger. Ed. vol. ii. p. 274. How could it be introduced if it had always been practiced by the apostles, and was implied in the command to *baptize?*

Dr. Rice says,—"Cyprian, who lived in the third century, and who was one of the most eminent of the Fathers, decidedly maintained the validity of baptism thus administered, (sprinkling,) and forbade rebaptizing such persons. The Council of Neo-Cæsarea and the Council of Laodicea sanctioned such baptisms." Page 46.

Now let us hear what Cyprian and the Council of Neo-Cæsarea say on this matter.

CYPRIAN'S REPLY TO MAGNUS. "You ask, dear son, what I think of those, who, in sickness, receive the sacred ordinance; whether, since they are not washed (loti) in the saving water, but have it poured on them, (perfusi,) they are to be esteemed right Christians. In the saving sacraments, when necessity obliges, and God grants his indulgence, *abridgments of divine things,* (divina compendia,) will confer the whole on believers." Paris Edit. 1643. Quoted in *R. Fuller on Bap.* p. 82.

Now let us notice a few facts in regard to the above passage.

1. Cyprian considered baptism essential to salvation.

2. He insisted on immersion in every case where it was possible, and would only allow of pouring when "necessity obliged," as he thought, and the dying man must be baptized in order to be saved.

3. This pouring he regarded as an "abridgment of the divine thing," immersion, and such an abridgment as was unauthorized by the Holy Scriptures and needed God's indulgence.

Now, does this look as if Cyprian regarded sprinkling as scriptural baptism? He evidently only considered it a substitute in case of necessity. Hear also

VALESIUS. "Rufinus rightly translates this *perfusum* (poured about.) For those who are sick, were baptized in bed, since they could not be immersed by the priest, they were only poured (perfundibantur) with water. Therefore baptism of this sort was not customary, and was esteemed *imperfect*, as being what appeared to be received by men laboring under delirium, not willingly, but from fear of death. In addition, since *baptism properly signifies immersion*, a pouring of this sort *could hardly be called baptism.* Wherefore, clinics (for thus were they called who had received baptism of this sort) were forbidden to be promoted to the rank of the presbytery, by the twelfth canon

of the Council of Neo-Cæsarea." *R. Fuller on Bap.* p. 81.

BARONIUS says, — "Those who were baptized upon their beds were not called Christians, but clinics." Ibid.

These evidences show that the Council of Neo-Cæsarea did not really regard pouring as a scriptural baptism. They allowed it to be done because they supposed it might have some saving efficacy upon one who was thought to be dying, and could not be immersed. But if he recovered, his baptism was regarded as but a half-perfect baptism; and on that account he was forbidden the enjoyment of some ecclesiastical privileges which others enjoyed whose baptism was perfect, that is, who had been immersed. Dr. Rice's appeal to Cyprian and the Council of Neo-Cæsarea is a signal failure. Their explicit testimony is that immersion was the only baptism that was then accounted perfect.

Prof. MOSES STUART, D.D., on Baptism. "In what manner, then, did the churches of Christ, from a very early period, to say the least, understand the word *baptizo* in the New Testament. Plainly they construed it as meaning *immersion*. They sometimes even went so far as to forbid any other method of administering the ordinance, cases of necessity and mercy only excepted." Nashville edition, page 153.

And when that exception of necessity was made they counted it an imperfect baptism, as the Council of Neo-Cæsarea shows. It was an *abridgment*

of the *divine* thing, as Cyprian declares. He was Bishop of Carthage from A.D. 248 to 257.

Again, Stuart on Baptism. "The mode of baptism by immersion, the Oriental Church has always continued to preserve, even down to the present time. The members of this Church are accustomed to call the members of the Western churches *Sprinkled Christians* by way of ridicule and contempt. They maintain that *baptizo* can mean nothing but *immerge*; and that *baptism by sprinkling* is as great a solecism as *immersion by aspersion*; and they claim to themselves the honor of having preserved the ancient sacred rite of the church free from change and from corruption, which would destroy its significancy." Page 151.

We have seen not only that *all* the churches for several of the first centuries of the Christian era, but that the Oriental or Greek Church, which now embraces Greece, Russia, and other large regions of country, held that immersion was the only perfect and scriptural baptism; that the Greek Church has always held that doctrine, and holds it yet. In the seventh century the Greek Church embraced Greece Proper, East Illyria, with Morea and the Archipelago, Asia Minor, Syria, with Palestine, Arabia, Egypt, and numerous congregations in Mesopotamia and Persia. It still has its patriarchs in Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.

But let us hear other testimony in regard to Dr. Rice's "general argument of great weight."

EDINBURGH ENCYCLOPEDIA, edited by Sir David Brewster, Art. Baptism. "The first law for sprinkling was obtained in the following manner: Pope Stephen II., being driven from Rome by Astolphus, King of Lombards, in 753, fled to Pepin, who a short time before had usurped the crown of France. While he remained there, the monks of Cressy, in Brittany, consulted him, whether, in case of necessity, baptism performed by pouring water on the head of the infant would be lawful. Stephen replied that it would. But though the truth of this fact should be allowed, which, however, some Catholics deny, yet pouring or sprinkling was admitted only in cases of necessity. It was not till the year 1311 that the Legislature, in a council held at Ravenna, declared immersion or sprinkling to be indifferent. In this country (Scotland), however, sprinkling was never practiced in ordinary cases till after the Reformation; and in England, even, in the reign of Edward VI., immersion was commonly observed. But during the persecution of Mary, many persons, most of whom were Scotchmen, fled from England to Geneva, and there greedily imbibed the opinions of that Church. In 1556 a book was published at that place, containing the form of prayers and ministration of sacraments, approved by the famous and godly learned man, John Calvin, in which the administrator is enjoined to take water in his hand, and lay it on the child's forehead. These Scottish exiles who had renounced the authority of the Pope

implicitly acknowledged the authority of Calvin; and returning to their own country with John Knox at their head, in 1559, established sprinkling in Scotland. From Scotland this practice made its way into England, in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized by the established Church."

Now, if it is true, as Dr. Rice says, that sprinkling had always been regarded as valid by the great majority of Christians from the days of the apostles, how happens it that in 753 the monks of Cressy ask the Pope whether, in *case of necessity*, pouring may be allowed? And how happens it that sprinkling or immersion were not regarded as indifferent until it was so declared by the Council of Ravenna in 1311? The simple truth is, immersion had been the universal and uniform practice for about thirteen hundred years, the only exception being in case of sickness, and then it was considered only a half-perfect and unscriptural baptism—an *abridgment* of the divine original. Sprinkling was not introduced into Scotland as equally valid with immersion until 1559, and subsequently it made its way into England.

In America, where freedom of religious worship and freedom of speech in regard to religion are most fully enjoyed, and where the Bible is most generally read by the masses of the people, the Baptists have greatly increased in numbers, until they now far exceed those denominations which once whipped, fined and imprisoned them in New England and Virginia. Large numbers in other denominations,

in this country, will accept of nothing but immersion for baptism; and nearly one half the members of Pedobaptist churches practically reject infant baptism, not having their children baptized.

About two millions of the present church members in the United States have been immersed, and many more would be, if they could satisfy the convictions of their consciences without too great a sacrifice of their present associations. "For twenty years," said one to me, "I prayed and wept over this duty, while I was a Methodist preacher, before I decided to obey God, cost what it might." Baptist sentiments have made vast progress in the last hundred years. Undoubtedly, the larger majority of professed Christians since the Christian era have been immersed, and believed that sprinkling and pouring were not scriptural baptism, Pedobaptists themselves being witnesses. And the progress of learning, the extension of liberty of speech and of worship, and the general circulation of the Bible, are not likely to stop the progress of those sentiments, but greatly to increase the diffusion of them.

The author's "argument of great weight" entirely fails. The proofs are directly against his position. Yet the advocates of sprinkling have resorted to this, again and again, as an argument almost demonstrating the truthfulness of their position.

On page 36 of his work on Baptism, Dr. Rice draws two conclusions from the doctrine that sprinkling and pouring are not scriptural baptism.

1. "That the overwhelming majority of Protestant Christians, to say nothing of Roman Catholics, are *unbaptized*. Amongst these are found great numbers of the wisest and best men the world has known."

Well, Dr. Rice will be obliged to admit that "the vast majority of Protestant Christians, amongst whom are found great numbers of the wisest and best men the world has known," do not believe in the Presbyterian form of Church government. Does this unpleasant conclusion constrain him to repudiate Presbyterianism? True, those who are only sprinkled are unbaptized; so the primitive churches would have regarded them; so would the churches for several hundreds of years afterward; and so would the Greek Church in all ages, Pedobaptists themselves being witnesses. If they would avoid this conclusion, let them abandon their error.

2. "That the churches which practice pouring or sprinkling are not true churches of Christ, and their ministers are not true ministers of Christ, but intruders into the sacred office and profaners of sacred things."

This word *true*, in the phrases "*true* churches" and "*true* ministers," is likely to mislead the reader. A man may be called of God to preach, and may accomplish much good in his ministry, and yet he may teach and practice one or more errors. If ministerial usefulness and success depended upon absolute perfection in every point of doctrine and

practice, few, if any, would ever be successful preachers. God does not withhold his spiritual blessings from all except those who have no errors. A church organization and ministers may be deficient in some things, and may practice other things not taught in the word of God. Pedobaptist churches and ministers, we think, do teach and practice contrary to the word of God in reference to the ordinance of baptism. Wherein they preach the gospel of Christ, we rejoice in it and bid them God speed, instead of regarding them as *intruders*. But wherein they teach for doctrines the commandments of men and set aside the ordinances of God, we stoutly resist them. We will call them gospel churches and gospel ministers just so far as they teach and practice *according* to the gospel, and no further. In baptizing infants, and in practicing pouring and sprinkling for baptism, we believe they **are entirely unscriptural.**

CHAPTER IV.

MEANING OF THE WORD BAPTIZE—PEDOBAPTIST FALLACIES.

Baptize a Greek word—Its meaning settles the controversy—How Pedobaptists try to make *baptizo* mean *wash* and then *sprinkle* as a mode of washing—The fallacy exposed—How lexicographers use *wash*, meaning immersion, as a definition of baptizo—Stephanus, Schleusner, Anthon—Washing with metal—The Supper, *eat*—To *cleanse*—Fallacy stated in syllogisms.

THE New Testament was written, by the inspired writers, in the Greek language. Our English New Testament is a translation from the Greek. *Baptize* is a Greek word, brought into our language from the Greek, and left untranslated. To ascertain its meaning, is to settle this whole controversy on the mode of baptism. If it means immerse, then immersion is the thing which is commanded by our Saviour, and which we ought to do. If it means to pour or to sprinkle, then pouring or sprinkling is the thing commanded, and which we ought to do.

Very few Pedobaptists, however, even pretend that *baptizo* means to sprinkle or to pour directly, or that sprinkling and pouring are to be counted among the definitions of the word. The way in

which they attempt to make out that pouring and sprinkling are baptism is this — they say *baptizo* means not only to immerse, dip, submerge, but also to *wash, cleanse* or *purify*. And *washing, cleansing* and purifying *may* be done by sprinkling or pouring, therefore they are baptism. This is virtually Dr. Rice's whole argument, and the argument of all the advocates for pouring and sprinkling.

The utter fallacy of this method of reasoning will appear, on a moment's reflection. They select *wash* as one of the definitions of *baptizo*, and then pretend that any method of washing is *baptizing*, or that every meaning which belongs to the word *wash* also belongs to the word *baptizo*. This is false logic, and wholly improper. Webster's second definition of *wash* is "to wet, to fall on and moisten, as the rain washes the flowers or plants,"—and so Pedobaptists say that since *wash* is sometimes given as a definition of *baptizo*, therefore to wet, to fall on and moisten as the rain, is baptism. This does not follow. Webster's first definition of *wash* is "to cleanse by ablution or by rubbing in water." This is just what the authors of the Greek Lexicons say they mean by *wash* when they use it to define *baptizo*,— thus, STEPHANUS says it means "to dip, immerse, as we immerse things for the purpose of coloring or washing." Also, SCHLEUSNER, "to plunge, immerse, to cleanse, wash, to purify, (*because* for the most part a thing must be dipped or plunged into water

that it may be washed.") So says DR. ANTHON, the most extensive editor of classical literature in America, and professor of Greek in Columbia College, New York. "The primary meaning of the word is to dip or immerse, and its *secondary meanings*, if it ever had any, *all* refer in some way or other to the same leading idea. Sprinkling, &c., are entirely out of the question."

Now, if every meaning which belongs to the word *wash* also belongs to *baptizo*, then, since Webster gives as one of the definitions of *wash* "to overlay with a thin coat of metal, as steel is *washed* with silver," this would be one of the meanings of *baptizo*. If sprinkling and pouring are baptism, because they are modes of washing, then covering with a thin coat of metal is baptism, for that is one process of washing.

Apply this mode of reasoning to the ordinance of the Supper. Jesus broke the bread and gave it to his disciples, saying, "Take, eat, this is my body." The command here is *eat* the bread. But, says one, "To consume is one of the definitions of *eat*, and to burn is one method of consuming, therefore *burning* the bread is one mode of *eating* it." Would men dare to talk thus in regard to the ordinance of the Supper? Yet this is precisely the argument constantly employed to show that sprinkling and pouring are baptism. They first give to a word of specific meaning, a generic or general definition, and

then say that any possible construction of this gene ral definition is a definition of the specific word.

To *cleanse* is given as one of the definitions of *baptizo* sometimes, but this evidently means only that cleansing which is accomplished by immersing the object in water. Are all the definitions of *cleanse* applicable to *baptizo?* Surely not, for Webster thus defines it. "To purify; to make clean; to remove filth or foul matter of any kind, or by *any process whatever*, as by washing, rubbing, scouring, scraping, purging, ventilation, &c., as to cleanse the hands or face; to cleanse a garment; to cleanse the bowels; to cleanse a ship; to cleanse an infected house." Who could be guilty of the absurdity of saying that any of the modes of *cleansing* would be a mode of *baptism.* Yet because *cleanse* is sometimes given as a definition of *baptizo*, and sprinkling and pouring are modes of cleansing, therefore, say Pedobaptists, they are modes of baptism. With equal propriety they might argue that rubbing, scraping, purging and ventilation are modes of baptism because they are modes of cleansing.

These illustrations show the *grand fallacy* which runs through nearly all Pedobaptist arguments on this subject. Stated in a syllogism it would read thus:

Baptism is a washing;
Sprinkling and pouring are washing;
Therefore sprinkling and pouring are baptism.

It is of the same character as the following:

Man is an animal;
A bird is an animal;
Therefore a bird is a man.

When learned disputants are obliged to resort to such sophisms as these, in order to defend sprinkling, their cause must be desperate.

CHAPTER V

MEANING OF BAPTIZO—GREEK LEXICONS.

Dr. Rice's researches—Baptizo, and not bapto, is the word in question—Three facts to be noticed—Lexicons quoted by Dr. Rice—Scapula, Hedericus, Stephanus, Schleusner, Parkhurst, Robinson, Schrivellius, Groves, Bretschneider, Suidas, Wahl, Greenfield—All against him—Other Greek Lexicons, Pasor, Donnegan, Jones, Rost, Pickering, Stokius, Robertson, Suicerus, Liddell and Scott, Anthon, Leigh, Richardson, Passow, Castell, Constantin, Schœttgenius, Trommius, Mintert—Sprinkling and pouring do not obey the command.

As baptize is a Greek word, one of the most direct methods of ascertaining its meaning is to examine the dictionaries or lexicons of the Greek language. These give the meaning of the word. Dr. Rice, the great Presbyterian scholar and controversialist, after years of study over the whole field of Greek lexicography, searching for something to sustain sprinkling for baptism, gives us the result of his research, in his debate with Mr. Campbell, on page 69 of "Campbell and Rice's Debate," and also in his separate work on Baptism, pages 67–69. Dr. Rice no doubt here presents the most favorable testimony he can obtain from the lexicons, after years of research and inquiry.

Much time is often spent in this controversy on the meaning of *bapto;* but as that word is never used in the Scriptures to denote the ordinance of baptism, I shall not discuss its meaning. *Baptizo* is the word invariably used to denote the sacred ordinance.

I shall quote the definitions given to *baptizo* by the twelve lexicons to which Dr. Rice appeals. While reading these definitions, we shall notice the following facts:

1. EVERY ONE of the lexicons quoted by Dr. Rice says that *baptizo* means to *dip, plunge* or *immerse.*

2. NOT ONE of them says it means to *sprinkle* or to *pour.*

3. NOT ONE of them gives a single definition that is opposed to immersion, or that does not admit of immersion.

GREEK LEXICONS QUOTED BY DR. RICE.

1. SCAPULA. *Baptizo,* to dip or immerse — also to dye; as we immerse things for the purpose of coloring or washing them; also to plunge, submerge, to cover with water; also to cleanse, to wash." "*Baptismos,* immersion, washing, cleansing, the act itself of immersing; also of washing or cleansing."

2. HEDERICUS. "To dip, immerse, to cover with water; to cleanse; to wash; to baptize in a sacred sense."

3. STEPHANUS. "To dip, immerse, as we immerse things for the purpose of washing or coloring; to merge, submerge, to cover with water, to cleanse, to wash."

4. SCHLEUSNER. "To plunge, immerse, to cleanse, wash, purify with water."

5. PARKHURST. "To immerse in or wash with water, in token of purification." (In C. & R.'s Debate, p. 59,) "figuratively to be immersed or plunged into a flood or sea, as it were of grievous affliction and suffering."

6. ROBINSON. "To immerse, to sink; for example, spoken of ships, galleys, &c. In the New Testament, to wash, to cleanse by washing,—to wash one's self, to bathe, perform ablution," &c.

7. SCHRIVELLIUS. "*Baptizo*, to baptize, to immerse, to cleanse, to wash."

8. GROVES. "To dip, immerse, immerge, plunge; to wash, cleanse, purify—*Baptizomāi*, to wash one's self, bathe," &c.

9. BRETSCHNEIDER. "Properly, often to dip, often to wash; to wash, to cleanse; in the middle voice, I wash or cleanse myself." (Or, as Mr. Campbell gives it more fully on pages 59, 60 of the Debate,) "An entire immersion belongs to the nature of baptism. This is the meaning of the word; for in *baptizo* is contained the idea of a complete immersion under water; at least so is *baptisma* in the New Testament." "In the New Testament *baptizo* is not used, unless concerning the sacred and solemn

submersion which the Jews used." "*Baptisma*—immersion, submersion. In the New Testament it is used only concerning the sacred submersion which the Fathers call baptism."

10. SUIDAS. "To sink, to plunge, immerse, wet, wash, cleanse, purify."

11. WAHL. "To wash, perform ablution, cleanse; to immerse."

12. GREENFIELD. "To immerse, immerge, submerge, sink. In the New Testament, to wash, perform ablution, cleanse, to immerse."

Here is the testimony of the lexicons as quoted by Dr. Rice. *Every one* of them gives *dip, plunge,* or *immerse* as the meaning of the word, and *not one* gives either *sprinkle* or *pour* as a definition. Not one gives a definition which is contrary to immersion, though the definition is given by them more than seventy times. Every one of them gives our definition, immerse, yet not one of them gives the Pedobaptist meaning to sprinkle or to pour. The testimony of the lexicons stands in an unbroken phalanx in direct opposition to Dr. Rice's argument for pouring and sprinkling.

Scapula, Stephanus, Bretschneider, and others, when they give *wash* as a definition, expressly tell us it is a washing done by immersion. This is doubtless the meaning of them all when they give wash, cleanse. or purify, for that is generally and most effectually done by immersion.

But Dr. Rice insists that to prove our position,

the lexicons should give but one definition, to immerse only. What! when a lexicon gives to *dip, plunge, immerse, submerge,* it uses four different words. Does it give four different definitions? Surely not. Four different words are used to express the *same* idea: so when it adds, to wash, cleanse, purify by immersing or plunging a thing in water, it still is but another form of words to express the same idea.

I shall now give the testimony of

OTHER GREEK LEXICONS.

13. PASOR, *Bapto* et *baptizo.* "To dip, to immerse, to dye, because it is done by immersing. It differs from *dunai,* which means to sink to the bottom, and to be thoroughly submerged." "Afflictions are compared to a flood of waters in which they seem to be immersed who are overwhelmed with the misfortunes and miseries of life; yet only so overwhelmed as to emerge again." Campbell and Rice's Debate, p. 59.

14. DONNEGAN. "To immerse repeatedly into a liquid; to submerge; to soak thoroughly, to saturate, hence to drench with wine. Metaphorically, to confound totally; to dip in a vessel and draw. Passive, to be immersed."

15. DR. JOHN JONES, of England. "Baptizo, I plunge, I plunge in water, dip, baptize, bury, overwhelm." C. and R. Debate, p. 59.

16. PROF. ROST, of Germany. "To plunge, to immerse, submerge." C. and R. p. 59.

17. Bass, of England. "*Baptizo*, to dip, immerse, plunge in water, to bathe one's self; to be immersed in sufferings or afflictions." Ibid.

18. Pickering. "*Baptismos*, immersion, dipping, plunging; metaphorically, misery or calamity, with which one is overwhelmed." C. and R. p. 60.

19. Stokius. "*Baptizo* generally, and by the force of the word, indicates the idea of simply dipping and diving; but properly, it means to dip or immerse in water." "In the New Testament it denotes the first sacrament, in which sacrament those to be baptized were anciently immersed in water." C. and R. p. 60.

20. Robertson's Thesaurus. "Baptizo, to immerse, to wash." C. and R. p. 60.

21. Suicerus. "Baptism properly denotes an immersion or dipping into." *Booth's Pedobap. Ex. Bap. Libr.* p. 348.

22. Liddell and Scott. (1857.) "*Baptizo*, to dip repeatedly; of ships to sink them. Pass. to bathe, soaked in wine; over head and ears in debt; a boy drowned with questions. II. To draw water. III. In New Testament to baptize."

In the first London and first American edition of Liddell and Scott's Lexicon, it defined baptizo thus: "To dip repeatedly, dip under, *to steep, to wet*, soaked in wine, *to pour upon, to drench*, over head and ears in debt." But in the second edition, the authors have expunged, as *incorrect* and *inadmissible*, the definitions *to steep, to wet, to pour upon*, and *to*

drench. They have repudiated these as *untrue.* Now *why* have these lexicographers expunged these definitions? Would they have done it if the word ever has those meanings? Surely not. Hence here is the proof that they believe *the word cannot bear those definitions;* a triumphant argument against the positions of Dr. Rice and of all advocates of sprinkling.

23. Dr. Anthon. "The primary meaning of the word is to dip or immerse, and its secondary meanings, if it ever had any, all refer in some way or other to the same leading idea. Sprinkling, &c., are entirely out of the question." *Letter to Dr. Palmley,* March 27, 1843.

24. Leigh, of England. "The native and proper signification of *baptizo* is to dip into water, or to plunge under water." *Pengilly,* p. 72.

Of Dr. Leigh, Mr. Horn says: "He was one of the most learned men of his time, and to this work (Critica Sacra) most succeeding lexicographers on the Old and New Testament have been greatly indebted." [Introduction to Sacred Scriptures, Sacred Philology, p. 92.]

25. Charles Richardson. "*Baptizo,* to dip or merge in water, to sink, to plunge, to immerse." *Bliss' Letters,* p. 15.

26. Passow is the basis of Liddell and Scott's. *Curtis on Prog. of Bap. Prin.* pp. 177–179.

27. Castell, Lex Heptaglott., defines it "to bathe, baptize, immerse." *App. to Stuart,* pp. 248, 249.

28. CONSTANTIN, Robert, Prof. of Belles Lettres in University of Caen, 1550, in his Greek Lexicon. "*Baptismos*, baptism, the act of dyeing; that is, of plunging." *Booth in Bap. Library*, p. 351.

29. SCHŒTTGENIUS. "*Baptizo*, from *bapto*, properly to plunge, to immerse, to cleanse, to wash." *Lex. Nov. Test. Booth in Bap. Lib.* p. 351.

30. TROMMIUS. "*Baptizo*, to immerse, to dip." Greek Concordance. *Booth in Bap. Lib.* p. 351.

31. MINTERT. "*Baptizo*, to baptize; properly, indeed, it signifies to plunge, to immerse, to dip into water; but because it is common to plunge or dip a thing that it may be washed, hence also it signifies to wash, to wash away. *Baptism*, immersion, dipping into, washing, washing away: properly, and according to its etymology, it denotes that washing which is performed by immersion." *Booth in Bap. Lib.* p. 351.

32. BAGSTER'S Greek Lex. of New Test. "*Baptizo*, to dip, immerse; to cleanse or purify by washing; to administer the rite of baptism, baptize. *Baptisma*, immersion, ordinance of baptism."

Here is the testimony of THIRTY-TWO Greek Lexicons and lexicographers, on the meaning of the word *baptize*, all of which unite in saying it means to dip, to plunge, to immerse, and not one of whom says it means to pour or sprinkle: the only one which ever gave *pour* as a definition having himself expunged it as untrue. Here, then, the whole array of Greek Lexicons say it means what we say it

means; and not one says it means to sprinkle or pour. They are all against Dr. Rice, and against sprinkling and pouring. Therefore when Dr. Rice sprinkles or pours, he does not baptize. He does not do any one thing which the Lexicons say the word means. He does not wash the candidate, nor cleanse him, nor bathe him. He does not baptize him. You who have been merely sprinkled or poured, have never been baptized. You have never obeyed the command. Jesus says, "If ye love me, keep my commandments."

CHAPTER VI.

MEANING OF BAPTIZO — OTHER LEARNED LEXICONS AND WITNESSES.

Michaelis—Schaaf—Fabricius — Schindler — Buxtorf—Auscher—Vartabed—Encycl. Americana—Edinburgh Encycl.—Kitto's Cyclop.—Alstidius—Wilson—Young—Bailey—Butterworth—Ash—Forty-seven Lexicons and authorities—Other Pedobaptist witnesses—Beza—Neander — Altingius—Bossuet—Hospinianus—Gurtlerus — Buddeus—Venema — Fritsche—Porson—Cattenburgh—Keckermannus—Stourdza—Jeremiah—Rodgers—Taylor—Campbell—Storr and Flatt—London Quarterly Review—Curcellius—Luther—Knapp—Bloomfield—Vitringa — Stuart—Calvin—Witsius — Zanchius — Chalmers—Pictet—Salmasius—Augusti — Brenner — Paullus — Scholz — Ikenius — Casaubon—Christopulus—Ridgeley—Limborch—Floyer — Poole—Valesius — Coleman — Edinburgh Review — Westenius — Melancthon—Barrow—Burmannus—Bentley—Beckermanus—Bucanus—Otto von Gerlach—Obey God rather than men—No substitutes for his commands.

1. MICHAELIS, in Lex. Syr., Gottingen, 1788. "To bathe, baptize, immerse, (ablutus est. baptizatus est. immersit.) *Appendix to Stuart on Bap.*, Nashville edition, p. 249.

2. SCHAAF. Lex. Syr., Lyons, 1708. "To bathe one's self; to bathe, dip, immerse into water, baptize." Ablutus se. ablutus, intinctus, immersus in aquam. baptizatus est. *Ut supra.*

3. Guido Fabricius. Lex. Syr. Chal., accompanying the Antwerp Polyglot, Antwerp, 1592. "To baptize, dip, bathe." *Ut supra.*

4. Schindler. Lex. Penteglot, Hanover, 1612. "To baptize, immerse into water, dip, bathe." *Ut supra.*

5. Buxtorf. Lex. Chal. et Syr., Basle, 1622. "To baptize, dip, bathe one's self." *Ut supra.*

6. Paschal Auscher, D.D. Dictionary of Armenian and English, Venice, 1825. "To baptize, to wash by plunging into water." *Ut sup.* 250.

7. Mekitar Vartabed's Armenian Dictionary, Venice, 1749, defines it the same as Auscher. *Ut supra.*

8. Encyclopedia Americana. Article, Baptism. "Baptism, that is, dipping, immersion, from the Greek word *baptizo.*"

9. Edinburgh Encyclopedia. Art. Baptism. "In the time of the apostles the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptized was dipped, in a river or vessel, with the words which Christ has ordered." *Fuller on Bap.* p. 22.

10. Kitto's Cyclopedia of Bib. Lit. "The whole body was immersed in water." Vol. i. p. 288.

11. Altstidius. Lex. Theol. "*Baptizein*, to baptize, signifies only to immerse and not to wash, except by consequence." *Haynes' Cyclopedia*, vol. i. p. 18.

12. Wilson's Christian Dictionary, 1678.

"Baptize, to dip, into the water, or plunge one into water." *Bliss' Let.* p. 15.

13. Dr. William Young's Dictionary. "To dip all over, to wash, baptize." *Ut supra.*

14. Bailey's Dictionary, Dr. Scott's edition, 1792. "Baptism, in strictness of speech, is that kind of ablution or washing which consists in dipping; and, when applied to the Christian institution so-called, *it was used by the primitive Christians in no other sense than that of dipping,* as the learned Grotius and Casaubon well observe." *Judson on Bap.* p. 24.

15. Butterworth renders baptizo, to dip, immerse or plunge. *Bliss' Let.* p. 16.

16. John Ash's Dictionary, London, 1776, renders baptize, "to dip, plunge, to overwhelm, to administer baptism." *Ut supra.*

17. Brande's Encyclopedia of Science, Literature and Art. Article Baptism. *Bapto.* I dip. Baptism was originally administered by immersion. At present sprinkling is generally *substituted* for dipping, at least in northern climates.

Here are forty-nine standard Lexicons and Encyclopedias, covering the whole field of Biblical literature, made by the learned scholars of different denominations, in different countries and in different ages, *all agreeing in the testimony that baptize means immerse,* and none of them saying it means to sprinkle or pour. Who then can accept of sprinkling

or pouring for baptism, without the conviction that they are not doing what our Saviour meant by the word *baptize?* We are led to say of sprinkling, as did Cyprian, it is "*an abridgment* of the divine thing" *immersion*, and needs "God's indulgence." Page 17.

Scapula, Stephanus and Bretschneider, when they mention *wash* as a definition, expressly tell us it was a washing by immersion: while Pasor, Donnegan, Jones, Rost, Pickering, Stokius, Suicerus, Liddell and Scott, Anthon, Leigh, Richardson, Passow, Castell, Constantin, Trommius and Mintert, define it to immerse, or words equivalent, and do not give wash as a definition. So also testify Auscher, Vartabed, Encyclopedia Americana, Edinburgh Encyclopedia, Kitto's Cyclopedia, Alstidius, Wilson, Young, Bailey, Butterworth and Ash. All the others testify that it means immerse, while some add the words wash, cleanse or bathe. We cannot doubt that they mean a washing, cleansing or bathing which is done by immersion, otherwise they would *contradict* all other lexicographers; but, with this meaning attached to the word wash, they all perfectly harmonize and all testify for immersion, and not one of them for sprinkling. What now becomes of Dr. Rice's "general argument of great weight," that "the whole Christian world, in all ages, so far as history can inform us, with the exception of a mere handful, stand arrayed against us?" The testimony of Greek lexicographers,

themselves Pedobaptists, is overwhelmingly against Dr. Rice's view, and in favor of the Baptist view. The best scholars of every nation, denomination and age, testify to the correctness of our views—that Christian Baptism is an immersion. Baptists are sometimes reproached as an unlearned people. We do not need much learning in order to defend our position, so long as all the most learned Pedobaptists of every land and age testify that we are right.

OTHER PEDOBAPTIST WITNESSES.

1. BEZA, the associate and colleague of Calvin at Geneva. "Christ commanded us to be baptized, by which word it is certain immersion is signified." *Pengilly*, p. 72. "To be baptized in water, signifies *no other* than to be immersed in water, which is the external ceremony of baptism." *Hague's Reply to Cooke and Towne*, p. 111.

2. NEANDER. "In respect to the form of baptism, it was in *conformity with the original import of the symbol, performed by immersion*, as a sign of entire baptism into the Holy Spirit, of being entirely penetrated by the same. It was only with the sick, where the exigency required it, that any exception was made; and in this case baptism was administered by sprinkling. Many superstitious persons, clinging to the outward form, imagine that such baptism by sprinkling was not fully valid; and hence they distinguished those who had been so baptized by denominating them *clinici*. The bishop

Cyprian expressed himself strongly against this delusion. "It is otherwise," he says, "the breast of the believer is washed; the soul of the man is cleansed by the merits of faith. In the sacraments of salvation, where necessity compels, and God gives permission, the divine thing, though outwardly abridged, bestows all that it implies on the faithful." *Neander's Ch. Hist.* vol. i. p. 310.

It is sufficient to say of the above, that we are simply inquiring what was the "original institution" and "import of the symbol," and not what "abridgment of the divine thing" Cyprian may have accepted instead of the "original institution." Sprinkled persons were called *clinici;* but we read of no *clinici* in the New Testament. Nor have we found the place where "God gives permission" to *abridge* his ordinances by doing something different from the original command. Neander's testimony as to the original institution and import of the symbol is most explicit.

3. ALTINGIUS, Prof. of Theol. at Heidelberg, 1620. "For *baptism* is immersion, when the whole body is immerged; but the term baptism is *never* used concerning aspersion." *Judson*, p. 10.

4. BISHOP BOSSUET. "To baptize signifies to plunge, as is granted by all the world." *Pengilly*, p. 72.

5. HOSPINIANUS. "Christ commanded us to be baptized, by which word it is certain immersion is

signified." Hist. Sacram, L. ii. c. 1, p. 30. *R. Fuller*, p. 19.

6. GURTLERUS. "To baptize, among the Greeks, is undoubtedly to immerse, to dip; and baptism is immersion, dipping. The thing commanded by our Lord is baptism, immersion in water." Institut. Theol., cap. 33, §§ 108, 109, 110, 115. *R. Fuller*, p. 19, 20.

7. BUDDEUS. "The words *baptizein* and *baptismos* are not to be interpreted of aspersion, but *always* of immersion." *R. Fuller*, p. 20.

8. VENEMA. "The word *baptizein*, to baptize, is nowhere used in the Scripture for sprinkling." *Ut supra.*

9. PROFESSOR FRITSCHE, a disciple of Hermann, in his Commentary on Matt. iii. 6. "Baptism was performed not by sprinkling, but by immersion: this is evident not only from the nature of the word, but from Rom. vi. 4. *Ut supra.*

10. PROF. PORSON. "The Baptists have the advantage of us. Baptism signifies a total immersion." *Carson*, p. 23.

Prof. Porson was the most celebrated linguist of the preceding generation, and gave this testimony Aug. 27, 1807.

11. CATTENBURGH. "In baptism the whole body is ordered to be immersed." Spicileg. Theol. L. iv. c. lxiv. Lec. ii. § 22. *Judson*, p. 11.

12. KECKERMANNUS. "We cannot deny, that the first institution of baptism consisted in immersion,

and not sprinkling." System. Theol., L. iii. c. viii. p. 369. *Ut supra.*

13. Stourdza, a native Greek. "The verb *baptizo* has only one acceptation. It literally and perpetually signifies to plunge. Baptism and immersion, therefore, are identical; and to say *baptism by aspersion*, is as if one should say *immersion by aspersion*, or utter any other contradiction of the same nature." Doctrine and Spirit of the Greek Church, p. 87. *Dr. J. Chase*, p. 63.

14. Jeremiah, the Greek Patriarch. "The ancients were not accustomed to sprinkle the candidate, but to immerse him." Walch's Controversies out of the Lutheran Church, vol. v. p. 477. *R. Fuller*, p. 74.

15. Daniel Rogers, a learned Episcopalian, says: "That the minister is to dip in water, the word denotes it. None of old were wont to be sprinkled." *Bliss*, p. 20.

16. Bishop Jeremy Taylor. "The custom of the ancient churches was not sprinkling, but immersion; in pursuance of the sense of the word in the commandment, and the example of our blessed Saviour." *Pengilly*, p. 18.

17. Dr. Geo. Campbell, the eminent Presbyterian divine of Scotland, and President of Marischal College, says, in his Note on Matt. iii. 11: "The word *baptizein*, both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse; and was rendered by Tertullian, the oldest of the Latin

fathers, *tingere*, the term used for dyeing cloth, which was by immersion. It is always construed suitably to this meaning." *Judson*, p. 11.

18. Drs. Storr and Flatt's Theology. "The disciples of our Lord could understand his command in no other manner than as enjoining immersion." Vol. ii. p. 290. "Under these circumstances, it is certainly to be lamented that Luther was not able to accomplish his wish with regard to the introduction of immersion in baptism, as he had done in the restoration of the wine in the Eucharist." Page 291.

19. London Quarterly Review. "There can be no question that the original form of baptism—the very meaning of the word—was a complete immersion in the deep baptismal waters, and that, for at least four centuries, any other form was either unknown or else regarded as an exceptional, almost a monstrous case." *Everts' Law of Bap.* p. 43.

20. Curcellius. "Baptism was performed by plunging the whole body into water, and not by sprinkling a few drops, as is now the practice. Nor did the disciples that were sent out by Christ administer baptism afterwards *in any other way*." *Judson*, p. 24.

21. Martin Luther. "The term baptism is a Greek word; it may be rendered into Latin by *mersio*—when we immerse anything in water, that it may be entirely covered with water. And though that custom be quite abolished among the generality, (for neither do they entirely dip children, but

only sprinkle them with a little water,) nevertheless they ought to be wholly immersed, and immediately to be drawn out again, for the etymology of the word seems to require it. The Germans call baptism *tauff*, from depth, which they call *tieff* in their language; as if it were proper those should be deeply immersed, who are baptized. And truly, if you consider what baptism signifies, you shall see the same thing required: for it signifies that the old man and our native character that is full of sin, entirely of flesh and blood as it is, may be overwhelmed by divine grace. The mode of baptism, therefore, ought to answer to the signification of baptism, so that it may show forth a sign that is certain and full." Opera, tom. 1, fol. 72, Witeburg, 1582. *Hague's Second Reply to Cooke and Towne*, p. 23.

22. KNAPP'S THEOLOGY. "*Baptisma*, from *baptizein*, which properly signifies to dip in, to wash by immersion." Vol. ii. p. 510. "Immersion is peculiarly agreeable to the institution of Christ, and to the practice of the apostolical church, and so even John baptized, and immersion remained common for a long time after; except that in the third century, or perhaps earlier, the baptism of the sick (baptisma clinicorum) was performed by sprinkling or affusion. Still, some would not acknowledge this to be true baptism, and a controversy arose concerning it; so unheard of was it, at that time, to baptize by simple affusion. *Cyprian first defended baptism*

by sprinkling, when necessity called for it, but cautiously and with much limitation." Vol. ii. p. 516.

23. Dr. Bloomfield, editor of Greek Testament, with notes. On Mark i. 9, he says, "The sense of *was baptized in*, is *was dipped* or *plunged into*. He underwent the rite of baptism by being plunged into the water."

24. Vitringa. "The act of baptizing is the immersion of believers in water. This expresses the force of the word. Thus also it was performed by Christ and the apostles." *Aphorismi. Theolog. App.* 884. *Judson*, p. 23.

25. Prof. Moses Stuart, D. D. of Andover. "*Bapto* and *baptizo* mean to dip, plunge, or immerse into anything liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note *are agreed in this.*" *Stuart on Baptism*, Nashville ed. p. 51.

26. Calvin, the founder of Presbyterianism. "The word baptize signifies to immerse, and the rite of immersion was practiced by the ancient Church." *In Stuart*, p. 156.

27. Witsius. "It cannot be denied that the native signification of the words *baptein* and *baptizein*, is to plunge, to dip." *Witsius' Works*, vol. iii. p. 390.

28. Zanchius. "The proper signification of baptize is to immerse, plunge under, overwhelm in water." *Pengilly*, p. 71.

29. Dr. Chalmers, of Scotland. "The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion, and

though we regard it as a point of indifference whether the ordinance so named be performed in this way or by sprinkling, yet we doubt not that the prevalent style of administration in the apostles' days was by *an actual submerging* of the whole body under water." *Chalmers on Rom.* vi. 4.

30. PICTET. "They immersed the whole body in water in order that the baptized might be counted a child of the covenant:—Now John (the Baptist) administered the rite among the Jews in the manner above described, and the same rite was used by Christ." *Pictet's Theology, published by the Presbyterian Board at Philadelphia*, p. 411.

31. SALMASIUS. "Baptism is immersion, and was administered in former times according to the force and meaning of the word." *R. Fuller, p.* 20. "Baptism signifies immersion, *not aspersion*, nor did the ancients baptize any but by dipping." In *Witsius' Works*, vol. iii. pp. 390, 391.

32. AUGUSTI. "The word baptism, according to etymology and usage, signifies to immerse, submerge, &c., and the choice of the expression betrays an age in which the latter custom of sprinkling had not been introduced." *R. Fuller*, p. 20.

33. BRENNER. "The word corresponds in signification with the German *taufen*, to sink in the deep." *R. Fuller*, p. 20.

34. PAULLUS. "The word *baptize* signifies in Greek sometimes to immerse, sometimes to submerge." Com. vol. i. p. 278. *R. Fuller*, p. 21.

35. Scholz. On Matt. iii. 6. "Baptism consists in the immersion of the whole body in water." *R. Fuller*, p. 21.

36. Ikenius. "The Greek word *baptismos* denotes the immersion of a person or thing into something." *Fuller*, p. 72.

37. Casaubon. "To baptize is to immerse." *Fuller, p.* 72. "This was the rite of baptizing that persons were plunged into the water; which the very word *baptizein*, to baptize, sufficiently declares." *Judson*, p. 11.

38. Christopulos, a Greek, in his "Confession of Faith," 6, 7, says: "We follow the example of the apostles, who immersed the candidate under the water." *Fuller*, pp. 74, 75.

39. Ridgeley's Body of Divinity. "The original and natural signification of the word *baptize* imports to dip." *Bliss' Letters*, p. 20.

40. Limborch, Professor of Divinity at Amsterdam from 1664 to 1712. "Baptism consists in washing or rather immersing the whole body in water, as was customary in primitive times." *Bliss' Letters*, p. 80.

41. Sir John Floyer. "Immersion is no circumstance but the very act of baptism." *Gill's Part and Pillar of Popery*, pp. 42, 43.

42. Poole's Continuators. Annot. on Matt. xx. 22. "To be baptized is to be dipped in water, metaphorically to be plunged in afflictions." *Benedict's Hist. Bap.* p. 178.

43. VALESIUS, in his edition of Eusebius' Eccl. Hist., speaking of the pouring of water all over Novatian while he was sick, says: "Moreover, since baptism properly signifies immersion, such perfusion (pouring over) could hardly be called baptism." *I. Chase on Bap.* p. 53.

44. COLEMAN'S Ancient Christianity Exemplified, p. 372. "The term *baptism* is derived from the Greek word *bapto*, from which term is formed *baptizo*, with its derivatives *baptismos* and *baptisma*, baptism. The primary signification of the original is to dip, to plunge, immerse. The obvious import of the noun is immersion." *Theodosia*, vol. i. p. 164.

45. EDINBURGH REVIEWERS. "They tell me (says Carson) that it was unnecessary to bring forward any of the examples to prove that the word signifies to dip, that I might have commenced with this as *a fixed point universally admitted.*" *Pengilly*, p. 72.

46. WETSTENIUS' Comment. on Matt. iii. 6. "To baptize is to plunge, to dip. The body or part of the body *being under water*, is said to be baptized." *Judson*, p. 10.

47. MELANCTHON, the companion of Luther, in his Confession of Faith, written by him in 1551, and adopted by the Saxon churches, says: "Baptism is an entire action, to wit, a dipping, and a pronouncing the words—I baptize," &c. *Howell on Communion*, p. 176.

48. ISAAC BARROW, Chancellor of Cambridge

University, England. "The action is baptizing or immersing in water. The mersion in water and the emersion thence doth figure our death to the former, (worldly defilement,) and reviving to a new life." *Booth's Ped. Ex.* p. 61.

49. Burmannus, Professor of Divinity at Utrecht, 1632–1679. "*Baptismos* and *baptisma*, if you consider the etymology, properly signify immersion." *Haynes' Cyclopedia*, vol. i. p. 118.

50. Richard Bentley, Professor of Divinity, Trinity College, England. "*Baptismous*, baptisms, *dippings*. *Haynes' Cyclopedia*, vol. i. p. 81.

51. Beckmanus, Theolog. Exercitat. xxii. p. 260. "Baptism, according to the force of its etymology, is immersion and washing or dipping." *Ut supra*, p. 82.

52. Bucanus' Body of Divinity, Geneva, 1630, London, 1659, Loc. 47, p. 605. "Baptism, that is immersion, and by consequence washing. *Baptistery*, a vat or large vessel of wood or stone, in which we are immersed for the sake of washing. *Baptist*, one that immerses or dips." Loc. 47, 2, 37, p. 631. "Our Lord was baptized of John, to signify that he was sent that he might be baptized, that is, immersed in death, and that he might wash away our sins with his own blood." *Haynes' Cyclopedia*, vol. i. p. 118.

53. Otto Von Gerlach. "The Greek word (baptizo) properly signifies *dip*. Baptism was performed in the first times of Christianity by *immersion* in water." Comment. on Matt. iii. 11. *Wiberg on Bap.* p. 32.

It would be easy to increase this list almost indefinitely. But these witnesses are sufficient to show conclusively that the best Pedobaptist scholars and theologians fully admit the correctness of our views as to the meaning of the word, and the practice of the primitive Church. Whatever apologies any of them may offer for their own departure from the practice of Christ and the apostles, and from what the Saviour meant by the command to baptize, those apologies do not affect the question under consideration; nor can they induce us to substitute sprinkling or pouring for the command of Jesus, which is immersion. "Whether it be right in the sight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." Acts iv. 19.

All the foregoing authorities, over one hundred in number, including the lexicons, bear directly upon the meaning of the word *baptize* as it was used and understood by Christ, the apostles and the primitive Christians. What that meaning is, we cannot doubt; for the testimony of the standard Greek lexicons, and of the most learned theological teachers among the various Pedobaptist denominations themselves, is unmistakably clear, that in the days of Christ and the apostles nothing but immersion was regarded as baptism; and that sprinkling and pouring were not used for baptism then, and we have no authority for adopting such substitutes now. 'Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you." John xv. 14.

CHAPTER VII.

MEANING OF BAPTIZO—CLASSICAL USE.

Prof Stuart's references to the classics—Classical use of *bapto*—Examples—Stuart never translates *bapto* by *sprinkle* or *pour*—Classical use of *baptizo*—Examples—All mean plunge, dip, sink, overwhelm, &c., and never sprinkle or pour—Dr. Conant's quotations of the classics—Summary of them—No example where *baptizo* means *sprinkle* or *pour*—Dr. Rice's quotations all mean *immerse* or *dip*—Strabo, Hippocrates, and Josephus—Overflowing of the tide—Dipping the plaster in breast-milk—Josephus—Homer—Plutarch—Battle of frogs and mice—Nebuchadnezzar wet with dew, *baptizo* not used.

ANOTHER method of ascertaining the meaning of *baptizo* is to examine the works of Greek authors, who lived before, during, and after the age of Christ and the apostles, and see in what sense they understood the word. In this baptismal controversy, which has extended through many years, the classical Greek writers have been thoroughly investigated. Scores of works in the Greek language are still extant, and are read in our colleges, and are accessible to all.

Doctors Stuart, Carson, and Conant, have given us the results of their thorough investigation of this subject. Prof. Stuart, in his work on baptism, has given us *more than a hundred quotations* from more than thirty different Greek writers, as Homer, Pin-

dar, Aristotle, Aristophanes, Herodotus, Xenophon, Plutarch, Lucian, Plato, Epictetus, Hippocrates, Strabo, Josephus, Polybius, &c. He has also given us his translation of every one of these passages. Many of these quotations do not contain the word *baptizo*, but *bapto*, which is never used in the Bible to denote the ordinance of baptism. *Baptizo* is the word invariably used in the New Testament to denote the ordinance.

The following are the quotations of Prof. Stuart,* showing the

CLASSICAL USE OF BAPTO.

HOMER. "As when a smith *dips* or *plunges* a hatchet or huge pole-axe in water," to harden it.

ARISTOTLE. "The colors enter into the pores of things *dipped* into them." "If a man *dips* anything into wax." "In the summer time they should *plunge* into cold water." "*Dipping* hay into honey."

ARISTOPHANES. "Taking the flea, he *dipped* or *plunged* two of its feet into it" (melted wax.)

HERODOTUS. "Going to the river, he *dips* himself with his clothes."

ARATUS. "*Dipping* his head into the sea." "*Dip* himself cloudless into the western flood." "The crow has *dipped* his head into the river."

XENOPHON. "*Dipping* a sword into a shield" (filled with the blood of a sacrifice.)

* They are found in Stuart on Baptism, Nashville ed. pp 52–65.

PLUTARCH. "Iron *plunged* into water to harden it."

PLATO. "They *plunge* it (the wool) into the dye-stuff."

HIPPOCRATES. "To *dip* the probes in some emollient." "*Dipping* the rag in ointment." "Cakes *dipped* into sour wine." "*Dipping* sponges in warm water." And in the same way, says Dr. Stuart, in all parts of his book, in instances almost without number. Dr. Stuart says, "The verb *bapto* means to *plunge* or *thrust* into anything that is solid but permeable; *to plunge in*, so as to cover or enclose the thing plunged."

SOPHOCLES. "Thou hast *plunged* thy sword into the Grecian army."

LYCOPHRON. "The child shal' *plunge* his sword into the viper's bowels."

PHILIPPUS. "He *thrust* his whole chin *into* the belly of the ram."

DIONYSIUS OF HALICARNASSUS. "One *thrust* his spear *between* the other's ribs."

EURIPIDES. "He *plunged* the scimetar into the flesh." Again, according to Dr. Stuart, "The verb *bapto* only is employed, in order to convey the meaning, to dip out, to dip up, by plunging a vessel into a liquid and drawing it up."

EURIPIDES. "Taking a vessel, *dipping* it, bring some sea water."

THEOCRITUS. "The maid shall *dip out* a cup of honey." "The lad hastening to *dip* his pitcher."

HERMOLAUS "He *dipped* his pitcher in the water."

LYCOPHRON. "*Dipping up* pleasure with foreign buckets."

ARISTOTLE. "One must *dip* the bucket and then draw it up."

EURIPIDES. "Bubbling water *dipped* up with pitchers."

CALLIMACHUS. "To-day, ye bearers of water, *dip up* none."

NICANDER. "*Draw up* the sea water itself."

Says Dr. Stuart, 4. "The verb *bapto* only (and its derivatives in point of form) signifies to *tinge, dye,* or *color.*" Also, "No doubt, then, can remain, that the word *bapto* means to tinge or color; and *in this respect* it seems plainly to differ from *baptizo.* I find *no instance* in which the latter is employed in this way." *Stuart,* p. 59.

Dr. Stuart here quotes several passages in which *bapto* is used in this sense. The Greek Lexicons of Scapula, Stephanus, Pasor, and Constantin, say it is so used, *because* the things were immersed or dipped in order to color them.

In the foregoing quotations and translations by Prof. Stuart, he has translated *bapto* by the words to *dip* or *plunge,* sometimes using one and sometimes both words, about thirty times, and never once by the words *sprinkle* or *pour.* He does not give a single example in which he thinks the meaning is to sprinkle or pour.

He says also, "*Bapto* is employed in the sense *to smear, to bathe*, by the application of liquid to the surface;" but his quotations evidently do not prove his position. They are as follows:—

SOPHOCLES. "Thou hast well *bathed or smeared* thy sword with the Grecian army, viz., by *plunging* it into the Grecian soldiers."

ESCHYLUS. "For the wife has deprived each husband of life, *bathing* the sword by slaughter." Stuart adds, "Bathing the sword means to make it reek with blood by *plunging* it into human bodies."

ARISTOPHANES. "Magnes, *smearing* himself with frog-colored paints." Here it means to *color*, not to smear or bathe.

DIONYSIUS, of Halicarnassus. "He struck him across the neck, and the whole sword *became warm with* blood," (evidently meaning *dipped* in blood so as to become warm.)

Stuart says, "A shade of meaning kindred to the above, viz., *to wash*, i.e., to cleanse by the use of water, is sometimes attached to the word *bapto* in the classics." He gives but one example.

ARISTOPHANES. "First they *wash* the wool *in warm water*." Of course, it was immersed.

The following are the quotations of Prof. Stuart, showing the

CLASSICAL USE OF BAPTIZO.

PINDAR. "As when a net is cast into the sea, the cork swims above, so am I un-*plunged* — like the

cork of a net in the sea, I am not *plunged* or *sunk*."

HERACLIDES PONTICUS. "When a piece of iron is taken red-hot from the fire, and *plunged* in the water."

PLUTARCH, speaking of the stratagem of a Roman general, says, "He set up a trophy on which, *dipping* his hand in blood, he wrote this inscription," &c. "*Plunge* yourself into the sea." "Then *plunging* himself into the lake Copias." Pages 53, 54.

LUCIAN. "I would press down the head of such an one when *sinking*, so that he could not rise up again."

DIODORUS SICULUS. "Whose ship *being sunk* or *merged*."

EPICTETUS. "As you would not wish, sailing in a large ship adorned and abounding with gold, to be *sunk* or *immerged*."

HIPPOCRATES. "Shall I not laugh at the man who *sinks* his ship by overloading it?"

STRABO. "Things that elsewhere cannot float, do not *sink* in the water of this lake." "An arrow will scarcely *plunge* in." "They marched a whole day through in the water, *plunged* in up to the waist." "Nor can any one who enters it *plunge in*, but is borne up."

POLYBIUS. "The foot soldiers passed through the water scarcely *immerged* to the paps."

JOSEPHUS. "The ship being about to *sink*." "Our ship being *immersed* or *sinking* in the midst of the Adriatic." "The boy being *immersed* in a pond,

perished." "They swam away from a *sinking* ship." "The wave being raised very high, *overwhelmed* or *immerged* them."

Stuart says, "It would be easy to enlarge this list of testimonies to usage; but the reader will not desire it. It is impossible to doubt that the words *bapto* and *baptizo* have, in the Greek classical writers, the sense of dip, plunge, immerge, sink. But there are variations from this usual and prevailing signification; i. e., shades of meaning *kindred* to this, (as happens in respect to most words,) some literal and some figurative, which demand, of course, our special notice." These shades of meaning, and all the passages he quotes in proof, I have quoted under the head of *Bapto*, on pp. 62–66. *Bapto*, and not *baptizo*, is the word used in all those passages quoted by Stuart on this point. And Stuart never pretends that *bapto* in any of those examples means to sprinkle or pour. The examples themselves show that it always means dip, color, or plunge.

Stuart says, "5. The word *baptizo* means *to overwhelm*, literally and figuratively, in a variety of ways."

ARISTOTLE. "Places beyond the pillars of Hercules, which, when it is ebb-tide, are not *overflowed*."

EVENUS. "He (Bacchus) *overwhelms* with a sleep near to death."

HELIODORUS. "When midnight has *overwhelmed*

the city with sleep." "*Overwhelmed* by misfortune."

CLEMENS, Alex. "By intoxication *overwhelmed* unto sleep."

PLATO. "I myself am one of those who were *drenched* or *overwhelmed* yesterday with wine." "Having *overwhelmed* Alexander with wine."

JOSEPHUS. "Seeing him in this condition, and *overwhelmed* by excessive drinking into shamelessness and sleep."

PHILO JUDEUS. "They become easily intoxicated, before they are entirely *overwhelmed* with wine."

DIODORUS SICULUS. "Most of the land animals that are intercepted by the river [Nile] perish, being *overwhelmed*." "The river, borne along by a more violent current, *overwhelmed* many." "They do not *overwhelm* their subjects with taxes."

JUSTIN MARTYR. "*Overwhelmed* with sins."

PLUTARCH. "The soul is nourished by moderate labors, but is *overwhelmed* by excessive ones." "*Overwhelmed* with debts." "*Overwhelmed* with business."

CHRYSOSTOM. "*Overwhelmed* with wine." "*Overwhelmed* with innumerable cares." "The mind *overwhelmed* with a multitude of cares." "*Overwhelmed* on all sides by the many waves of business." "*Immerged* in malignity."

Stuart says, "It were easy to increase the number of examples; but these are enough to exhibit both the literal and metaphorical sense of the word.

The reader will observe that in all these examples, the word *baptizo* (and not bapto) is employed; which, with the usage in Nos. 2, 3, 4, is a conclusive argument against supposing that these two words are in all respects synonymous."

Stuart has here given thirty-nine examples of the use of *baptizo*, and in *not a single instance* does he translate it by *sprinkle, pour, wash, cleanse* or *purify;* but eight times he translates it *plunge,* once *dip,* once *overflowed,* five times *immerse,* six times *sink,* and eighteen times *overwhelmed.* Yet Dr. Stuart was earnestly seeking to find some authority for sprinkling and pouring. But he does not find it in the classical use of the word *baptizo.* It does not admit of such a rendering. Dr. Stuart has given us more than a hundred quotations from the classics, and in *not one of them* has he translated either *bapto* or *baptizo* by *sprinkle* or *pour.* The words never mean to sprinkle or pour; hence sprinkling and pouring are not baptism.

T. J. Conant, D. D., for many years a Professor in Madison University, and in Rochester University, in a recent work, has given every passage in the Greek classical writers, and early Christian writers, in which the word *baptizo* occurs. He says, "The examples of the common meaning and use of the word in sections I. and II. are from every period of Greek literature in which the word occurs. They include all that have been found by lexicographers, and by those who have professedly written on this

subject, and these, with the examples added from my own reading, exhaust the use of the word in Greek literature."

In sections I. and II. Dr. Conant gives one hundred and seventy-five examples of the classical use of *baptizo*, and in section V. he gives sixty-one more from the early Christian writers, making two hundred and thirty-six examples in all. He quotes the passages in the original Greek, and also gives a translation. The following is a summary of Dr. Conant's quotations:

In the 175 quotations from the Greek classics, he translates *baptizo* by *immerse*, 44 times; *immerge*, 15 times; *submerge*, 22 times; *dip*, 10 times; *imbathe*, 2 times; *plunge*, 17 times; *whelm*, 56 times; *overwhelm*, 9 times—175.

In his 47 quotations from the Greek Christian Fathers, he gives the meaning *buried in water* 11 times; *immersion*, 36 times—47.

In his 14 quotations from early Latin Christian writers, he gives the meaning *buried in water* 3 times; *immersed*, 11 times—14. Total, 236.

Here, then, is a thorough investigation of all the classics, and not a single example is found in which *baptizo* means to sprinkle or pour; but the evidence presented sets the matter beyond all reasonable doubt, that it means to *immerse*, or what is equivalent to that, in every instance.

To show how conclusive is this testimony of the classics, we need only to cite the examples which

Dr. Rice selects out of them all, after years of research, as those which he thinks look the least like immersion, and the most favorable to sprinkling and pouring. They are found in "Rice on Baptism," pp. 84–87, and some of them are in "Campbell & Rice's Debate," pp. 93, 94.

DR. RICE'S CLASSICAL REFERENCES.

Says Dr. Rice, on Baptism, pp. 84, 85 :—

"1. It is frequently used in the sense of *sinking.* Strabo, speaking of a lake near Agrigentum, says, 'Things that elsewhere cannot float, do not *sink,*' (baptizesthai.) Again, he says of a certain river, 'If one shoots an arrow into it, the force of the water resists it so much that it will scarcely *sink,*' (baptizesthai.) Hippocrates. 'Shall I not laugh at the man who *baptizes* or *sinks* his ship by overloading it.' Diodorus Siculus. 'The most of land animals being caught by the river, *sinking,* perish.' Josephus. 'After the misfortune of Cestius, many of the Jews of distinction left the city, as people swim from a *sinking* ship.' Of Jonah, 'When the ship was on the point of *sinking.*'"

Now, can any one avoid seeing that an *immersion* is meant *in every case* cited above by Dr. Rice? Surely there is no sprinkling nor pouring implied in those passages. *Sinking* must mean immersion in every one of the examples cited. Would the learned author quote such passages from the classics to prove that *baptize* does not mean immerse, if he

could find any that were *more favorable* to his cause?

Dr. Rice says, "2. *Baptizo* is used to signify the overflowing of land by tide. Aristotle says, 'The Phœnicians, who inhabit Cadiz, relate, that sailing beyond Hercules' Pillars, in four days, with wind at east, they came to a land uninhabited, whose coast was full of sea-weeds, and not *baptized* at ebb; but when the tide comes in it is wholly covered.'"

Does *baptizo* in the above passage mean *sprinkle*, *pour*, or *immerse*? When the tide came in, were the land and weeds sprinkled, poured, or immersed? Dr. Stuart, himself a Congregationalist, translates the word in this passage *overflowed*. [Stuart on Baptism, p. 60.] Dr. Conant translates it *immersed*. When the land was "wholly covered" and "overflowed," it was immersed. Webster's definition of *immerse* is, "1. To put under water or other fluid; to plunge; to dip. 2. To sink or cover wholly, as to be *immersed* in a wood. 3. To plunge; to overwhelm; to involve; to engage deeply, as to immerse in business or cares." The passage means that the land and sea-weed were not *baptized*, that is, not *immersed*, at ebb-tide; but when the tide comes in, they are wholly covered. This passage inevitably sustains our views of *baptizo*, and condemns Dr. Rice's view. That he should select such a passage from the whole range of the classics to sustain the cause of sprinkling, is proof that arguments from that source are scarce.

Dr. Rice says, "3. *Baptizo* is used in the sense of wetting, by the application of a fluid to the substance. Hippocrates directed that a blister-plaster should be moistened (*bapsas*) with oil of roses; and if it should be too painful, it should be *baptized* again (*baptizein*) with breast-milk and Egyptian ointment. No one can believe that the word is here used in the sense of immersing." See *Conant*, Example 70.

Why not, Dr. Rice? Did Hippocrates mean *sprinkle* the plaster into milk and ointment? Did he mean *pour* it into milk and ointment? Or did he mean *dip* it or *immerse* it in milk and ointment? Is there any difficulty in immersing a plaster in milk? Is there any more difficulty in immersing it in breast-milk than any other milk? Prof. Stuart quotes five passages from this same writer, Hippocrates, and once he translates it *sink* (spoken of a ship) and four times translates it *dip*—"*dip* the probes in ointment," "*dipping* the rag in ointment," "cakes *dipped* in sour wine," "*dipping* sponges in warm water." Stuart adds,—"And in the *same way*, in all parts of his book, in instances almost without number." Dr. Rice says no one *can* believe that the word is here used in the sense of immersing. How flatly he contradicts Prof. Stuart, and the dictates of common sense! Yet these are the great *classical arguments* of the learned and shrewd Dr. Rice to sustain sprinkling!

Dr. Rice says, "In Num. xix. 17, 18, we find

the following law: 'And for an unclean person, they shall take of the ashes of a burnt heifer of purification for sin, and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel; and a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip in the water and sprinkle it on the tent,' &c. Josephus, in giving an account of this ceremony says, they baptized (*baptizantes*) the ashes with the spring of water." Page 87.

Josephus does *not say "baptized* the ashes *with* the spring of water;" but baptized the ashes *in* a fountain or spring: *eis pēgēn.* The Latin version of this passage of Josephus renders it "ejusdemque cineris aliquantulum in aquam *immergentes,*" &c. *Immersing some of the ashes in water.* Bekker's edition of Josephus gives the passage "tes tephras oligon eis pēgēn enientes kai hussōpon baptisantis," *casting a little of the ashes into a fountain and dipping the hyssop,* &c. Surely there is nothing in this passage to prove that *baptizo* does not mean to immerse. Whichever reading of the passage you take, it means dip or immerse. Bekker's edition says he *dipped* or baptized the hyssop; and the other says he *immersed* or baptized the ashes, and the Latin translation of the passage says he *immerged* some of the ashes. See Dr. Conant's work on *Baptizein,* Example 69. Dr. Conant has quoted fourteen passages from Josephus, each containing the word *baptizo,* and in every one it is rendered by *immerse, submerge, dip, immerge, plunge,* or *overwhelm* These show conclusively that Josephus

understood the meaning of the word to be to dip or immerse, and *never* to pour or sprinkle.

Dr. Rice quotes from Homer,—"He struck him across the neck with his heavy sword, and the whole sword became warm with blood." Pseudo-Didymus says, "the sword was *baptized* with blood;" and Dionysius says, "Homer expresses himself with the greatest energy, signifying that the sword was so *baptized* with blood that it was even heated by it."

Pope translates it,—

"*Plunged* in his throat, the smoking weapon lies."

Surely this means he *plunged* his sword into his neck, into his blood, so that the sword became warm in consequence. He did not *sprinkle* his sword into his neck, nor *pour* it into his blood, but he *plunged* it in. Yet Dr. Rice says the action of immersing is not found here!

Again Dr. Rice says,—"Plutarch relates that a Roman general, a little before he died of his wound, 'set up a trophy, on which, having *baptized* his hand with blood, he wrote this inscription,' &c. Every reader can judge for himself, whether he *immersed* his hand in blood, in order to write." Page 88.

It is necessary, moreover, to correct Dr. Rice; for Plutarch does *not say* he baptized his hand *with* blood, but *in* blood. The Greek reads, "*eis* to haima tēn chiera baptisas." The preposition *eis* does not mean *with*, but *in* or *into*. Did the dying general *sprinkle* his hand into the blood? Did he *pour*

it in, or did he *dip* his hand in blood and write? Prof. Stuart translates the passage, "He set up a trophy, on which, *dipping* his hand into blood, (eis to haima . . . baptisas,) he wrote this inscription," &c. Stuart, p. 54. Dr. Conant translates the passage, "*dipping* his hand into the blood." Ex. 67. Dr. Rice asks, (in Debate, p. 93,) "Is not baptizo here used simply in the sense of *wetting* or *moistening?*" No, indeed; for he might have *dipped* his hand in lampblack, Venetian red, or ochre, and written, if such substances had been present, and not moistened his hand. The moistening would depend upon the substance in which he dipped his hand, and not on the *action* expressed by the word baptized, or dipped. Moistening or wetting might be the *result* of dipping, or it might not; but it is not expressed by the word *baptisas*, dipping. The passage undoubtedly means, "*dipping* his hand in blood, he wrote," &c., as Prof. Stuart says.

When such passages are brought forward by learned men in proof of sprinkling, after the amplest opportunity of research through the whole range of classical literature, we cannot avoid the impression that they have searched in a field that furnishes scanty proof indeed of the truth of their position. If better proof could be found, they would surely bring it forward. But they do the best they can for their cause, and these are the strongest passages they can bring forward from the classics. But these

utterly fail them, and triumphantly sustain the Baptist view.

Dr. Rice, on page 76, refers to the passage so often quoted by Pedobaptists from Homer's battle of the frogs and mice. He says,—"He (the frog) breathless fell, and the lake (*ebapteto*) was *baptized* with blood."

Dr. Rice knows that the word *baptize* is not in that passage! He knows it, because he has given the word that *is* found there, *ebapteto*, (derived from *bapto*,) and not *baptizo*. Yet he gravely tells us the lake was *baptized* with blood. Why should he make such a statement? Yet Pedobaptists have repeated it again and again, while every one who has read the passage in Greek, knows that the word *baptizo* is not used in the passage at all. The word *bapto* is the word found in that passage, but *bapto* is *never* used in the Scripture to denote the ordinance of baptism. Dr. Stuart expressly tells us that *bapto* has shades of meaning which *do not* belong to the word *baptizo*. Hear his words:—

"No doubt, then, can remain, that the word *bapto* means to *tinge* or *color;* and in this respect it seems plainly to differ from *baptizo*. I find *no instance* in which the latter is employed in this way." *Stuart*, pp. 59, 60.

Dr. Rice quotes various other passages where *bepto* is used; but as this word is not the one which denotes the ordinance of baptism, it is unnecessary to discuss those quotations. Among these passages

is one from the Septuagint version of Dan. iv. 25, 33 (Septuagint, Dan. iv. 22, 30): "Nebuchadnezzar was *wet* with the dews of heaven." How many have quoted this, "Nebuchadnezzar was *baptized* with the dew of heaven," though the word *baptize* is not in the passage at all! Dr. Rice commits this very fault on page 147. "Now substitute plunge for *baptize*; then we shall read, Nebuchadnezzar was *plunged* from the dew of heaven." Baptizo is not in the passage at all, but *bapto*. Another passage containing *bapto*, and not *baptizo*, is Rev. xix. 13: "He was clothed with a vesture *dipped* in blood." Origen, speaking of this passage, says,—"A vesture *sprinkled* with blood." Therefore some conclude that Origen used *sprinkle* as meaning the same as *baptized*, whereas the word *baptizo* does not occur in the passage, but *bapto*.

We have briefly but carefully surveyed the whole of the Greek classical writers as to their use of this word *baptizo*, except its use in the Septuagint, and the early Christian writers, which will be found in Chapters IX. and X. The testimony of the classics is overwhelmingly conclusive that the word *baptizo* means to *dip*, *plunge*, or *immerse, and never* to *sprinkle* or *pour*.

CHAPTER VIII.

MEANING OF BAPTIZO — SACRED SENSE OF BAPTIZO.

Dr. Peters' argument—Its fallacy—Dr. Rice's argument—Stuart—Gives no example, refutes his own position—The early churches understood it to mean immerse in the New Testament—Sacred use agrees with the classical—Immersion.

MANY Pedobaptist writers of late have labored hard to show that, though in Greek literature the word should mean to immerse, and not to sprinkle, yet it may have been used by religious writers in quite a different sense. Words, they say, change their meaning. Says Absalom Peters, D. D., the Congregationalist, in his work on Baptism, p. 22–24:—

"The question in dispute can never be settled by proving the meaning of the word *baptizo* in ancient *heathen* Greek. If it meant there *immersion and nothing else*, still that could not govern its meaning as used by Christ and his apostles to designate an action which was utterly unknown to the Greeks of all preceding ages."

In proof of this, Dr. Peters says: "The word *pneuma*, (Spirit,) for instance, in the most ancient Greek, meant *wind* or *breath*, and nothing further

But in adapting this word to express the ideas of revealed religion, the sacred writers use it to signify Spirit, as the Spirit of man, and the Spirit of God. The word *angel*, in heathen Greek, signified a *messenger*, a person by whom news is conveyed; and the idea of a *spiritual messenger* from God, called *angel*, was unknown to the Greek language."

Now Dr. Peters' argument here utterly fails to meet the case. Even if we grant that sacred writers used *pneuma* and *angelos* in a different sense from the heathen Greeks, it is evident they did so because there was no word in the language to express the idea of *Spirit* and *spiritual messenger*. But this is not the case with baptism. The Greek language has plenty of words to express the action which this ordinance required. If the sacred writer had wished to say *wash*, he would have used *louo;* to cleanse or purify, *kathairo* or *katharizo;* to sprinkle, *raino* or *rantizo;* to pour, *cheo;* to wash the hands, *nipto;* to sink, *duno;* to consecrate or sanctify, *hagiazo;* to dedicate, *egkainizo*, &c. There is no lack of words in Greek to express any of these ideas and many more similar ones. Hence there could be no necessity for giving to *baptizo* any meaning different from what all the Greeks understood it to mean. In the use of the words *pneuma* and *angelos*, there was a necessity of giving them a somewhat modified sense, because there were no other words to express the idea of spirit and angel. The fact that the sacred writers used the word *bap-*

tizo to immerse, in speaking of the sacred ordinance, instead of selecting *louo*, to wash, *rantizo*, to sprinkle, *katharizo*, to purify, or *hagiazo*, to consecrate, or *cheo*, to pour, is conclusive evidence that they meant *immerse*, and did not mean wash, sprinkle, pour, purify or consecrate. If they had meant any of these latter acts, they would have used the appropriate word. But as they meant *immerse*, they selected the most appropriate word in the Greek language to express it, namely *baptizo*.

Says Dr. Rice, p. 56: "Suppose the immersionist to prove that, even in our Saviour's day, the word *baptizo* was used by *Pagan Greeks* ordinarily in the sense of *immersing;* would it follow that the Jews employed it with reference to religious ablutions in the same sense? No; for multitudes of Greek words are used in the Septuagint and in the New Testament in a sense in which they are never found in classic authors. On this point, the following declarations of Prof. Stuart are pertinent: 'New Testament usage of the word *baptizo* in cases not relevant to this rite, clearly does not entitle you (immersionists) to such a conclusion with any confidence. If you say the classical usage of the word abundantly justifies the construction I have put upon it, my reply is, that classical usage can never be very certain in respect to the meaning of a word in the New Testament. Who does not know that a multitude of Greek words have received their coloring and particular meaning from the Hebrew,

and not from the Greek classics. Does *theos*, (God,) *ouranos*, (heaven,) *sarx*, (flesh,) *pistis*, (faith,) *dikaiosune*, (righteousness,) and other words almost without number, exhibit meanings which conform to the Greek classics; or which, in several respects, can even be illustrated by them? Not at all. Then how can you be over-confident in the application of the classical meaning of *baptizo* when the word is employed in relation to a rite that is purely Christian? Such a confidence is indeed common; but it is not the more rational, nor the more becoming on that account.'"

The foregoing paragraph has already been answered. If the sacred writers used *theos*, *ouranos*, *sarx*, *pistis*, and *dikaiosune*, or any other words, in any different sense from their common classical meaning, they did so because there was no word in the Greek language which could better express their meaning. I have shown that no such necessity existed for using *baptizo* out of its classical sense. There are plenty of other words to express kindred ideas, to wash, to pour, to purify, to sink, to dedicate, to consecrate or sanctify, &c.; but instead of using any of these words to denote the ordinance, the sacred writers selected *baptizo*, to immerse. Immersion is then what they meant, and not *wash* or *purify*, &c.

It is a significant fact that neither Prof. Stuart, after making the above statement, nor Dr. Rice, after quoting it with approval, presents us a single

passage of Scripture in which he even pretends that *baptizo* is used by the sacred writers in a different sense from the classical meaning, *immerse*. They do not give a single passage in proof or illustration of their argument. Why not give us the passages of Scripture which exhibit this variation from the classical meaning if they can be found? One *example* of such variation is better proof than a thousand *possibilities*.

Prof. Stuart himself utterly overthrows all the foregoing extract. He says, (p. 153,) "*In what manner, then, did the churches of Christ,* from a very early period, to say the least, *understand the word baptizo in the New Testament? Plainly, they construed it as meaning immersion.*"

This is explicit. Prof. Stuart says the churches of Christ construed it to mean immersion *in the New Testament* as well as in classical usages. Again,

Stuart on Bap., p. 154, "That the Greek *fathers*, and the Latin ones who were familiar with the Greek, understood the usual import of the word *baptizo*, would hardly seem to be capable of denial."

Stuart, p. 147. "The passages which refer to immersion are so numerous in the *fathers*, that it would take a little volume merely to recite them."

Stuart, p. 149. "But enough. 'It is,' says Augusti, 'a thing made out,' viz., the ancient practice of immersion. So, indeed, all the writers who have thoroughly investigated this subject conclude. I

know of no one usage of ancient times which seems to be more clearly made out. I cannot see how it is possible for any candid man who examines the subject to deny this."

This is surely sufficient to settle the New Testament usage of *baptizo*. The churches of Christ and the earliest Christian writers all understood it to mean *immerse*, in the New Testament. They could not be mistaken in regard to this.

It seems most singular that Prof. Stuart, after making such frank and candid admissions in regard to the New Testament usage of *baptizo*, should suggest that *possibly* it might have been used by the sacred writers in a different sense from its classical one *immerse;* while he himself declares that the churches and early Christian writers understood it to mean immerse in the New Testament. When such men as Prof. Stuart allow themselves to be entangled in such meshes of contradiction, in order to make it seem *possible* that sprinkling *might have been* regarded as baptism by the sacred writers, we cannot resist the conviction that they have a difficult cause to sustain.

CHAPTER IX.

USE OF BAPTIZO IN THE SEPTUAGINT.

Septuagint, when and how made—*Naaman*—*Judith*—The passage quoted—Plainly immersion—Dr. Fairchild's remark—Dr. Rice's argument—His four conclusive evidences refuted—Immersion required by the Levitical law—Maimonides, Witsius, Encycl. Rel. Knowl. Law of Moses—"Modesty"—In a fountain—Dr. Rice's false criticism upon *Epi*—Dr. Hibbard—Immersion not enough—Common practice of immersing—Horne's Introduction—Judith's circumstances required immersion—Baptizing after touching a dead body—Dr. Rice's strange logic—Evident fallacy—Bathing *in water*, required in Num. xix. 19—Example in Isaiah, Job, Psalms—All confirm the meaning of baptizo to be immersion.

THE SEPTUAGINT is the translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew into Greek, made by seventy-two Jewish rabbis in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt, about 285 years before the birth of Christ. Says the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, "This is the version, and this only, which is constantly used and quoted in the gospels and by the apostles, and which has thereby received the highest sanction which any writings can possibly receive." It is said that "Ptolemy sent an embassy to Eleazar, then high priest of the Jews, to request of the latter a copy of the Hebrew

Scriptures, and that there might also be sent to him seventy-two persons—six chosen out of each of the twelve tribes—who were equally well skilled in the Hebrew and Greek languages." These learned men were accordingly shut up in the "Island of Pharos," where they completed their work, which was deposited in the Alexandrian Library. See *Horne's Introduction to the Bible,* vol. i. chap. iii. Lec. iii. § 2.

NAAMAN.

The first passage in the Septuagint which contains the word *baptizo* is 2 Kings v. 14. It is said of Naaman, the Syrian leper, whom Elisha told to go and wash in Jordan seven times, "Then went he down and dipped (*baptized*) himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God; and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a child, and he was clean."

Here it signifies *immersion.* He *dipped* himself seven times in Jordan. He did not pour nor sprinkle himself into the Jordan; but dipped himself according to the saying of the man of God. Now, Elisha had told him to *wash* seven times in Jordan. Yet it is said he dipped himself *according to the saying of the man of God.* Here we see plainly that when the sacred writer speaks of *washing,* it is a *dipping* that is meant. So, when the divers *washings* are mentioned, it is the divers dippings or immersions.

Dr. Rice says Jerome speaks of Naaman as *wash-*

ing himself in the Jordan. Well, that is what Elisha commanded. And the fact that in compliance with that command he dipped himself seven times in Jordan, shows in what sense Elisha used the word wash; and Jerome of course used it in the same sense. So in most, if not all the Jewish *washings*, it is meant a *washing* by dipping or immersing.

Yet, to such absurdities do the advocates of sprinkling go, that I have heard one from the pulpit insist that Naaman was sprinkled in the Jordan, and did not dip himself,—a flat contradiction of the word of God. It was even insisted that Elisha commanded Naaman to observe the Levitical law for the cleansing of the leper. On the contrary, Elisha makes not the slightest reference to the Levitical law. The Levitical law prescribed the method of ceremonial cleansing after a leper had been healed. But Naaman came to Elisha to be healed, not to be *ceremonially cleansed* after he was healed.

Leviticus xiv. 2, 3. "This shall be the law of the leper in the day of his cleansing: he shall be brought unto the priest. And the priest shall go forth out of the camp, and the priest shall look; and behold if the plague of leprosy be healed in the leper," &c. Did Elisha wait till it was healed? Did he do as this regulation prescribes? Did he kill the bird over running water, and sprinkle Naaman with blood and water with a hyssop branch, as the Levitical law prescribed in verses 5–7? Nothing of

the kind. He said, "Go and wash in Jordan seven times." And in compliance with the command, he went and dipped (baptized) himself seven times in Jordan.

JUDITH.

The next passage in the Septuagint which contains the word *baptizo* is in the apocryphal book Judith, xii. 7. "Holofernes commanded his guard that they should not stay her. And thus she abode in the camp three days, and went out by night into the valley of Bethulia and washed (baptized) herself in a fountain of water by the camp."

Judith was a Jewish woman who had gone to the Assyrian camp pretending to be ready to betray the Jews, and thus gaining ready access to Holofernes, the Assyrian general, was received by him to his tent, and treated with great consideration; her real design being to destroy Holofernes and rout his army, which she successfully accomplished.

The whole passage referred to reads as follows in the common version of the Apocrypha:

Judith xii. 5–9. "Then the servants of Holofernes brought her into the tent and she slept till midnight; and she arose when it was toward the morning watch, and sent to Holofernes, saying, Let my lord now command that thy handmaid may go forth to prayer. Then Holofernes commanded his guard that they should not stay her. Thus she abode in the camp three days, and went out in the night into the valley of Bethulia and *washed* (bap-

tized) herself in a fountain of water by the camp. And when she came out, she besought the Lord God of Israel to direct her way to the raising up of the children of her people. So she came in clean, and remained in the tent until she did eat her meat at evening."

The whole account is plainly in favor of *immersion* as the act she performed. She arose after *midnight*, and *toward the morning watch went out* into the *valley of Bethulia*. Why did she do all this, if she wished merely to wash her hands, or pour a little water on her, or sprinkle herself? Why *go out* at all, if it was merely to sprinkle or pour a little water, or wash her hands or face? Why go out *in the night near the morning watch*, the very time when the army would be the most soundly asleep? Why go out in the night into the *valley of Bethulia*? The word *valley*, (Greek *pharanx*,) says Donnegan, means "a chasm, a ravine, a narrow precipitous valley." This was a retired and secluded place, just suitable for the purpose of a modest female who wished to immerse herself. She retired to this place attended only by her maid-servant, at the dead hour of night, and immersed herself in the fountain. She did just what was necessary for *immersion*, but what was wholly *unnecessary*, and even preposterous, for merely sprinkling or pouring a little water, or washing her hands. In her tent she had every facility for washing hands, pouring or sprinkling; for verses 1 and 2 say, "Then he com-

manded to bring her in where his plate was set, and bade that they should prepare for her of his own meats, and that she should drink of his own wine; and Judith said, I will not eat thereof lest there be an offence, but provision shall be made for me of the things which I have brought." Thus we see she was abundantly provided with common conveniences, both by Holofernes and by what she had herself brought, but these would not answer her purpose, hence she must *go out—by night*—into the *valley of Bethulia;* surely not to wash her hands or to pour or sprinkle a little water on her, but to *immerse* herself in the fountain.

Hear Dr. Fairchild, whose work is published by the Presbyterian Board: "Now, can any one suppose that this refined, high-born lady would disrobe in the presence of the soldiers and immerse herself? Believe it who can! She simply washed her face, hands, and feet." Page 31.

What shall we think, when an eminent divine and a grave Board of Publication put forth such things for arguments? Not a word is said about her baptizing herself *in the presence of the soldiers.* Every circumstance shows the contrary. She went out in the *night* into a *valley*, or, as Donnegan defines *pharanx*, a chasm, a ravine, a narrow, precipitous valley, attended only by her maid-servant; just such circumstances as would be suitable for her *immersion*, but wholly unnecessary for sprinkling or pouring. Dr. Fairchild says she washed her

hands, face, and *feet.* He asserts it as positively as if he had been there and seen the operation. Well, it says she washed (baptized) *herself.* Dr. Hibbard says, "She must cleanse or purify her *person.*"

Dr. Rice, speaking of Judith, (C. and R.'s Debate, p. 145,) says,—"Here is a baptism which the attending circumstances and the language employed prove not to have been an immersion. She baptized or washed herself not *into* but *at* a fountain. It was a *fountain,* a *spring,* not a large stream. Did she immerse herself *at* a spring? But she was in the military camp of Holofernes, where regard to decency forbid her immersing herself. Here, then, is a clear example of the use of the word to denote washing by the application of water to the body by *pouring.*"

Now, his argument here is, that decency forbade her immersing herself. While the facts show that for the sake of decency and propriety she *went out —in the night*—into the *valley of Bethulia* and immersed herself. Dr. Rice calls this a clear example of *pouring.* If this is the *clear* example, what must the others be?

Dr. Rice also says, (Rice on Bap. pp. 89, 90,)—"Did Judith immerse herself? The following evidences are conclusive against such a supposition, viz.: 1. She was a Jewess; and no law of Moses required immersion in order to purification. That

law, in some instances, required *washing*, but not immersion. The Hebrew word used is *rahartz*, to wash, which is sometimes translated *bathe*, but never *dip*. 2. It is most improbable that a chaste female would immerse herself in a military camp. 3. She *baptized* herself at a *fountain* or spring. To suppose she immersed herself in a spring, is simply ridiculous. 4. Besides, the language forbids the idea. It is not said she baptized herself *in* or *into* the spring, but at (*epi*) it. The preposition *epi* never means *in* or *into*."

Let us notice Dr. Rice's four *conclusive evidences* that Judith did not immerse herself.

1. "She was a Jewess, and no law of Moses required immersion in order to purification."

Let us see if no law of Moses required immersion. Leviticus xi. 32,—"And upon whatsoever any of them (unclean animals) doth fall, it shall be unclean, whether it be any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack, whatsoever vessel it be, wherein any work is done, *it must be put into water*, and it shall be unclean until the even; so shall it be cleansed." Here immersion or putting into water is explicitly enjoined.

Lev. xiv. 8. "And he that is to be cleansed shall wash his clothes, and shave off all his hair, and wash himself in water that he may be clean."

In regard to what is meant by such a washing as is alluded to, let a Jewish Rabbi answer:—

MAIMONIDES.* "Wherever, in the law, washing of the flesh, or of the clothes, is mentioned, it means nothing else than dipping of the whole body in a laver; for if a man dips himself all over except the tip of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness." *Hilchoth Mikva*, ch. i. § 2. And again: "Every one that is baptized [as they were coming from the market] must immerse the whole body." And again: "In a laver which holds forty *seahs* [100 gallons] of water, every defiled man dips himself, except a profluvious man; and in it they dip all unclean vessels. A bed that is wholly defiled, if he dip it part by part, is pure. If he dip the bed in the pool, although its feet are plunged in the thick clay at the bottom of the pool, it is clean. What shall he do with a pillow or bolster of skin? He must dip them and lift them out by the fringes." *Hilchoth Cailim*, ch. xxvi. These quotations are from the "words of the Scribes, the commandments of the wise men." *Adkins on Bap.* pp. 107, 108.

WITSIUS, also, vol. iii. p. 385, speaking of the Jewish baptisms: "The entire body was to be plunged at once, for if but the tip of the finger was

* Maimonides, one of the most distinguished Jewish scholars, was born at Cordova, in Spain, in 1139. "He was physician to the Sultan Saladin, under whose protection he established a celebrated seminary at Alexandria. He wrote many works. The Jews call him the *Doctor*, the great *Eagle*, the *glory of the West*, the *light of the East*, and consider him inferior only to Moses." *Encyclopedia Americana.*

undipt, such a person was accounted to remain still in his uncleanness."

Lightfoot and Adam Clarke. "The baptism of John was by plunging the body *after the same manner as the washing unclean persons was.*" *Clarke's Com. at the end of Mark*

Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Article, Impurity, p. 650. "These legal pollutions were removed by bathing, and lasted no longer than the evening. The person polluted plunged over head in water."

Let us now turn to other passages of Moses.

Lev. vi. 28. "But the earthen vessel wherein it was sodden shall be broken; and if it be sodden in a brazen pot, it shall be both scoured and rinsed *in water.*"

Lev. xv. 5 "And whosoever toucheth his bed, shall wash his clothes and bathe himself *in water.*" The same expression, bathe himself *in water,* is repeated in the 7th, 8th and 10th verses. Verse 12, "Vessel of wood shall be rinsed *in water.*"

Lev. xvii. 15. "Every soul that eateth that which died of itself, shall wash his clothes and bathe himself *in water,* and shall be unclean until the even."

Numbers xxxi. 23. "All that abideth not the fire shall he make to *go through the water.*"

Lev. xv. 21. "Whosoever toucheth her bed, shall wash his clothes and bathe himself *in water.*" 27. "Shall wash his clothes and bathe himself *in water.*"

When Elisha told Naaman to *wash* seven times in Jordan, Naaman went and "dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God."

Yet Dr. Rice says, "No law of Moses requires immersion;" therefore Judith did not immerse herself!!

2. "It is most improbable that a chaste female would immerse herself in a military camp." What breach of modesty was there in her going out—by night—into the valley of Bethulia, attended only by her maid, and immersing herself? Why should she do all this, if it was not to immerse herself, but merely to pour a little water on her? If she immersed herself, she did just what the thirty-two Greek lexicographers we have quoted say the word *baptizo* means. If she poured herself in the fountain, she did what none of them say *baptizo* means. Who can doubt her immersion? But hear Dr. Rice's third "*conclusive evidence.*"

3. "She baptized herself at a *fountain* or *spring.* To suppose she immersed herself in a spring is simply ridiculous."

What ridiculous? Are all fountains too small for immersion? Especially a fountain flowing in a *valley*, a ravine, a narrow, precipitous valley,—has it no place of sufficient depth for immersion? No pools, or eddies?—when in all probability the valley was *made* by the flowing of water there? Yet, to Dr Rice, it seems "ridiculous" to think Judith

could immerse herself in a fountain in the valley of Bethulia. This is one of the Dr.'s "*conclusive evidences.*"

4. "Besides, the language forbids the idea. It is not said she baptized herself *in* or *into* the spring, but at (*epi*) it. The preposition *epi* never means in or into." [The Latin Vulgate renders it (v. 7) *baptizabat se in fonte aquæ.*]

But the common version of the Apocrypha says, "She (baptized) washed herself *in* a fountain of water by the camp." The translators of the Apocrypha did not agree with Dr. Rice in saying that *epi* never means *in*, for they have translated it *in* in *this very passage.* But the common reader can see how utterly reckless and erroneous Dr. Rice is in his criticism on the Greek preposition *epi;* for by opening the Greek Concordance, I find that *epi* is translated *in* or *into* no less than *twenty-four* times in the book of Matthew alone. The following are some of the passages in which *epi* is translated *in* and *into:*— Matt. xiii. 8, "Some fell *into* good ground." Matt. xiii. 14, "*In* them is fulfilled the prophecy." Matt. xiii. 20, "He that received the seed *into* stony places." Matt. xviii. 5, "Whoso shall receive one such little child *in* my name." Matt. xviii. 16, "*In* the mouth of two or three witnesses." Matt. xxii. 9. "Go ye *into* the highways." Matt. xxiv. 5. "Many shall come *in* my name." Matt. xxiv. 30, "They shall see the Son of Man coming *in* the clouds of heaven." Matt. xxvii. 43, "He trusted *in* God," &c.

Doubtless this preposition is translated *scores of times* in the New Testament by *in* and *into*. Yet Dr. Rice says it never means *in* or *into*, and this is his last *conclusive evidence* that Judith did not immerse herself. Even if *in* only meant *at*, it would not injure our argument. One asks me, where did you immerse them? I reply *at* the river, at the pond, at the creek, at the pool. These expressions by no means indicate that it was not done in the water. Such expressions *are common* when everybody understands that we went *into the water*. And with what cool self-complacency he snubs Dr. Carson and Mr. Campbell, in the remark, "A figure of speech, a bold conjecture, or a prudent silence, is quite sufficient to deliver our immersionist friends from all their troubles." It will take more than these to deliver Dr. Rice from all his troubles in the *conclusive evidences* that Judith was not immersed.

Hear what Dr. Hibbard, the Methodist writer, says of Judith. "Simple immersion or bathing could not have sufficed: she must *cleanse* or *purify* her person. She might have immersed herself and still returned without the necessary cleansing." *Hibbard on Bap.* Part ii. p. 64.

Surely doctors disagree. Dr. Fairchild says she only washed her hands, face and feet; Dr. Rice says it is a *clear* example of *pouring;* while Dr. Hibbard says that *immersion* was *not* enough, could not have sufficed. She must cleanse her whole person. Two Pedobaptist authors will not admit that

she was immersed, and another says immersion was not enough.

What says Dr. Hibbard in regard to the *common practice* of bathing and immersing in that country for the sake of pleasure, decency and health? He says, "Within this climate lies the land of Palestine. It was such a climate that originated the demand for *baths*, and *pools* and *fountains* throughout the East, and made the practice of bathing to be common. And, we repeat it, it was this *universal custom of bathing*,—a custom so indispensable to *pleasure*, to *decency* and to *health*, among the Orientals—which, more than anything else, gave a bias to their minds to immersion instead of affusion." *Hibbard on Bap.* Part ii. p. 152.

Since bathing and immersion were so common and so necessary, what was there strange or unreasonable in Judith's immersing herself as she did?

See also Horne's Introduction to the Bible, vol. ii. p. 170, where is found the following:—

"The *bath* was also very agreeable to the inhabitants of the East, (Ruth iii. 3. 2 Sam. xi. 2. 2 Kings v. 10); and it is not at all surprising that it should have been so, since it is not only cooling and refreshing, but is absolutely necessary in order to secure a *decent* degree of cleanliness in a climate where there is so much exposure to dust. The bath is frequently visited by Eastern ladies, and may be reckoned among their *principal recreations*. Those Egyptians, who lived in the earliest period of which

we have any account, were in the habit of bathing in the waters of the Nile. It was one of the civil laws of the Hebrews that the bath should be used. (Lev. xiv. 8; xv. 8; xvii. 15, 16.) We may, therefore, consider it as probable that public baths, soon after the enactment of this law, were erected in Palestine, of a construction similar to that of those which are so frequently seen at the present day in the East." What could be more natural, then, or appropriate, than for Judith to immerse herself?

I have dwelt upon this case at some length, because it is so frequently perverted, misconstrued, and abused by Pedobaptists, that it deserved this attention. How often do advocates for sprinkling say, like Dr. Fairchild, "Did she disrobe in the presence of the soldiers, and immerse herself?" or like Dr. Rice, "Decency forbade her immersion;" or, as I heard one say from the pulpit, "Was she *nude*, or did she return with dripping garments?" Modesty is more shocked by these utterly gratuitous allusions by learned Pedobaptists, than by the idea that she immersed herself in a fountain in the valley of Bethulia, attended only by her maid, and at the dead hour of night, toward the morning watch.

It is evident that Judith took special pains to avoid ceremonial impurity. She was in a military camp of gentiles or heathens. Holofernes offered to furnish her food and drink from his own table. But this she declined. Judith said, "I will not eat thereof, lest there be an offence; but provision shall

be made for me of the things which I have brought." If she was thus careful about her food, she would be equally careful of her person. And being surrounded by things which the Jews regarded as ceremonially unclean, she took the pains to purify her person by an entire immersion, and selected such circumstances as made it proper for her to do so. There was no breach of modesty, for she took the pains to avoid that, by *going out* in the dead of *night*, into a retired *ravine*, attended only by her maid. I think the candid reader will at once conclude that the meaning of the word *baptizo*, and all the attendant circumstances in the case of Judith, show conclusively that she immersed herself; and that the word *baptizo* is here employed in the same sense in which the classics and the early Christian writers all commonly use it, to denote immersion.

EXAMPLE FROM ECCLESIASTICUS OR SIRACH.

In the apochryphal book Ecclesiasticus or Sirach, Chap. xxxi. 80, (or, as some headings have it, xxxiv. 25, and Dr. Rice, xxxi. 25,) the following passage is found:—

"He that is *baptized* after touching a dead body, if he touch it again, what is he profited by his washing?" Dr. Rice says, (Rice on Bap. pp. 90, 92,)—"The reader will immediately notice the fact, that the word *baptizomenos* is here used in precisely the same sense as *loutro;* and no one denies that this latter word signifies *washing in any mode.*"

Here again is false reasoning. It is not true that *baptizomenos* and *loutro* are used in precisely the same sense, and that any meaning of *loutro* is also a meaning of *baptizo*. I have already shown the fallacy of this reasoning on pages 80, 81. Reduced to a syllogism, it is simply this:—

Baptism is a washing;
Sprinkling and pouring are washing;
Therefore sprinkling and pouring are baptism.

It would be equally good logic to say—

Immersion is a washing;
Sprinking and pouring are washing;
Therefore sprinkling and pouring are immersion.

It is equivalent in logic to this—

A man is an animal;
A horse is an animal;
Therefore a horse is a man.

Dr. Rice says because *loutro* (washing) is used in this passage of the Apocrypha when speaking of *baptism*, therefore it is equivalent in meaning, and *any mode* of washing would then be baptism.

Let us see if this accords with the common usage of language. Take the sentence—

"A horse attempted to swim the river, but the *animal* was drowned before it reached the opposite shore."

According to Dr. Rice's reasoning, the word *animal* is used in this sentence in precisely the same sense as *horse*. But *animal* means *any kind* of animal; therefore any kind of an animal is a horse.

Baptism is a *loutro*, or washing;
Loutro means any kind of a washing;
Therefore any kind of washing is baptism.

This is Dr. Rice's argument, the absurdity of which must be apparent to every candid thinker.

But he attempts to sustain his position by reference to the ritual law of cleansing one who had touched a dead body, recorded in Num. xix. 16–19, where Dr. Rice says we shall "find *sprinkling* required, but *no immersion*." The 19th verse reads, "And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean on the third day, and on the seventh day, and on the seventh day he shall purify himself, and wash his clothes, and *bathe himself in water*." Now Naaman, when told to go and *wash*, understood it to mean to *dip himself* in Jordon. Maimonides, the learned Jewish rabbi, says, "Wherever, in the law, washing of the flesh or of the clothes is mentioned, it means *nothing else than dipping the whole body* in a laver; for if a man dip himself all over except the tip of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness." Yet Dr. Rice finds sprinkling in the law, but no immersion!!

The foregoing are all the examples which Dr. Rice quotes from the Septuagint. Another example from the Septuagint is found in Van Ess' edition, (Lipsiæ, 1824.) It is Isaiah xxi. 4: "Iniquity *overwhelms (baptizes)* me."

In Aguila's Greek version of the Old Testament, which is attributed to the first half of the second

century after the birth of Christ, Job ix. 31 is thus given: *En diaphthora baptiseis me*,—"Thou shalt *plunge* me in the ditch."

In Symmachus' version of the Old Testament in Greek, which is attributed to the last half of the second century, Ps. lxviii. 3 (Eng. Bible, Ps. lxix. 2) is rendered, *Ebaptisthen eis aperantous katadu-seis*,—"I am *plunged* into bottomless depths," or in the common version, "I *sink* in deep mire."

All these examples are but confirmations of the use of *baptizo* to signify immersion, and not sprinkling or pouring. What, then, shall we think of Dr. Rice's conclusions on page 98? "1. That classic usage does not enable us to decide in what sense it was used by our Saviour. 2. In the Scriptures and apocryphal writings there is no single instance in which it can be proved to mean immerse." Hear Prof. Stuart in contrast with Dr. Rice: "In what manner, then, did the churches of Christ, from a very early period, to say the least, understand the word baptizo in the New Testament? Plainly they construed it as meaning immersion" *Stuart on Bap.* p. 153.

CHAPTER X.

USE OF BAPTIZO BY JOSEPHUS AND THE EARLIEST CHRISTIAN WRITERS.

Josephus — Barnabas — Hermas—Philo—Justin Martyr—Tertullian—Clement of Alexandria—Hippolytus—Origen—Cyprian—Cornelius—Athanasius—Baptism in tears and blood—Jerome—Ambrose—Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea—Gregory Nazianzus—Cyril of Jerusalem—Basil—Case of baptizing wood on the altar—Dr. Rice refuted—Heliodorus—Chrysostom—Augustine—Apostolical Canons—Cyril of Alexandria.

Dr. Fairchild's recent work on Bap. p. 105, says, "No authentic account can be produced of its existence (immersion) during the first two hundred years after Christ." This is issued by the Presbyterian Board of Publication. The following testimony will decide the question.

Josephus, the Jewish writer, who was born A. D. 37, and was consequently cotemporary with the apostles and evangelists, could not fail to know the meaning of the word *baptizo*, as used by the Jews at the very time the New Testament was written. The earliest Christian writers, as well as Josephus, also understood its meaning—and also the practice of the apostles. From their writings, then, we can obtain conclusive evidence of the meaning of the

word and the primitive practice. Let us now examine their testimony. The following extracts from their writings will enable the reader to decide how they understood *baptizo.*

1. JOSEPHUS. Born A. D. 37. (The examples from Josephus are found in Conant on *Baptizein.*) "Continually pressing down and immersing (*baptizing*) him while swimming, as if in sport, they did not desist until they had entirely suffocated him." *Conant,* Example 16.

"And there, according to command, being immersed (*baptized*) by the Gauls in a swimming bath, he dies." *Ib.* Ex. 17.

"The pilot voluntarily submerged (*baptized*) the vessel." *Ib.* Ex. 18.

"And many [of the vessels]—the billow rising high above, submerged (*baptized*)." *Ib.* Ex. 19.

"The ship being just about to be submerged (*baptized*)." *Ib.* Ex. 20.

"Our vessel having been submerged (*baptized*)—we swam the whole night." *Ib.* Ex. 21.

"They were submerged (*baptized*) along with their vessels." *Ib.* Ex. 22.

"He (Simon) plunged (*baptized*) the sword into his own neck." *Ib.* Ex. 68.

"Dipping (*baptizing*) a hyssop branch, they sprinkled." *Ib.* Ex. 69. See also pp. 73, 74, of this work.

"This, as a final blast, overwhelmed (*baptized*) the tempest-tossed youth." *Ib.* Ex. 96.

Josephus always uses it to mean immersion, and never sprinkling or pouring.

2. Barnabas, the companion and fellow-laborer with the apostle Paul. "Consider how he has joined the cross and the water together. For this he saith: 'Blessed are they who put their trust in the cross and descend into the water, for they shall have their reward in due time.'" *Barnabas' Gen. Epistle*, ch. x. v. 10, 11.

"We go down into the water full of sins and pollutions, but come up again bringing forth fruit, having in our hearts the fear and hope which is in Jesus, by the Spirit." Chap. x. ver. 14.

3. Hermes, who was also cotemporary with Paul, and is mentioned in Rom. xvi. 14. "They (the apostles) went therefore into the water with them, and again came up." *Similitude* ix. ver. 157.

4. Philo the Jew, born about the middle of the first century, and cotemporary with the apostles. "Those who are glutted with drink and food are least intelligent, as though the reason were whelmed (*baptized*) by the things overlying it." *Conant*, Ex 136.

5. Justin Martyr, born near the close of the first century of the Christian era.

"Whelmed (*baptized*) with most grievous sins." *Conant*, Ex. 131.

"What advantage can result from that *baptism* which purifieth the body only? *Baptize* ye the soul from wrath, and from avarice, from murder and from

hatred, and behold the body will be clean." *Stovel on Discipleship*, p. 359. *Conant*, Ex. 227.

"They (the candidates) are led by us to where there is water, and are born again in that kind of new birth by which we ourselves were born again. For upon the name of God, the Father and Lord of all, and of Jesus Christ our Saviour, and of the Holy Spirit, the immersion in water is performed." *Stovel on Discipleship*, p. 360. Dr. Wall remarks, "This is the most ancient account of the way of baptizing, next to the Scriptures; and shows the plain and simple manner of administering it." Mr. Reeves, the learned translator of Justin's works, adds, "'Tis evident from this plan of Justin and that of Tertullian (de Cor. Mil. c. 3) that ponds and rivers were the only Baptisteries or Fonts the Church had for the first two hundred years." *Pengilly*, p. 74.

6. TERTULLIAN. Born about A. D. 150, and wrote about A. D. 200. "The person, in great simplicity, is let down into the water, and with a few words said, is dipped. Nor is there any difference between them whom John dipped in the Jordan, and those whom Peter dipped in the Tiber." *Pengilly*, p. 74.

"And last of all commanding that they should immerse (tinguerent) into the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit." *Conant*, Ex. 206.

"Then we are three times immersed (mergitamur) answering somewhat more than the Lord prescribed in the Gospel." *Ib.* Ex. 207.

"When, entering into the water, we profess the Christian faith, in words of his own law." *Ib.* Ex. 208.

Says Prof. Stuart, pp. 144–146, "Tertullian speaks of a baptized person as *in aquam demissus*, let down into the water; i.e., immersed, and *inter panca verba tinctus*; i.e., dipped between the utterance of a few words." "Nor is there any difference of consequence between those whom John immersed (tinxit) in the Jordon, or Peter in the Tiber." Tertullian himself seems to have regarded this *trine* immersion as something superadded to the precepts of the gospel; for thus he speaks in his book De Corona Militis, § 3: "Thence we are thrice immersed, (ter mergetamur,) answering somewhat more (amplius aliquid respondentes) than the Lord has decreed in the gospel."

7. CLEMENT, of Alexandria, a distinguished Christian writer, who wrote about A.D. 200.

"You were led to a bath, as Christ was conveyed to the sepulchre, and were thrice immersed, to signify Christ's three days' burial." Mystagog. 2. *Adkins on Bap.* p. 127.

"Plunged (baptized) by drunkenness into sleep." *Conant*, Ex. 119.

"Immersed (baptized) in ignorance." *Ib.* Ex. 127.

"They plunge (baptize) from sobriety into fornication, teaching to indulge the pleasures and passions." *Ib.* Ex. 128.

8. HIPPOLYTUS, a Christian bishop about A.D. 200.

"For thou hast just heard how Jesus came to John, and was immersed (baptized) by him in the Jordan. O wonderful transactions! How was the boundless 'river that makes glad the city of God' bathed in a little water; the incomprehensible fountain that sends forth life to all men, covered by scanty and transitory waters." *Ib.* Ex. 203.

"Thou sawest, beloved, how the prophet foretold the cleansing of the holy immersion (baptism.) For he who goes down with faith into the bath of regeneration, is arrayed against the evil one, and on the side of Christ. He comes up from the immersion (baptism) bright as the sun." *Ib.* Ex. 226.

Says Dr. Bunsen upon Hippolytus and his age, "The candidate for baptism was immersed in water, and admitted as a brother upon his confession of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." *Bunsen's Hippolytus*, vol. ii. p. 179; *Curtis on Prog. of Bap. Prin.* p. 114.

9. ORIGEN, A. D. 200. "Whelmed (baptized) by wickedness." *Conant*, Ex. 164.

10. CYPRIAN, Bishop of Carthage, A.D. 248–257 "You ask, dear son, what I think of those who, in sickness, receive the sacred ordinance; whether, since they are not washed (loti) in the saving water, but have it poured on them, (perfusi,) they are to be esteemed right Christians. In the saving sacraments, *when necessity obliges, and God grants his indulgence, abridgments of divine things* (divina

compendia) will confer the whole on believers." *Judson on Bap.* p. 27.

Nothing is plainer than that Cyprian regarded pouring water over a candidate (perfusi) such an *abridgment* of the divine thing *immersion*, as needed God's indulgence, and must be permitted only when *necessity obliges*, even though the baptism be regarded as a "*saving sacrament.*" See pp. 22–34.

11. CORNELIUS, Bishop of Rome about A.D. 250. "He (Novatian) fell into a grievous distemper, and it being supposed that he would die immediately, he received baptism, being sprinkled with water on the bed whereon he lay, *if that can be termed baptism.*" *Judson*, p. 28.

It is evident that Cornelius did not regard sprinkling as *scriptural* baptism. Says Dr. Knapp, concerning such cases, "Some would not acknowledge this (sprinkling of the sick) to be true baptism, and a controversy arose concerning it—so *unheard of* was it to baptize by simple affusion." *Knapp's Theol.* vol. ii. p. 510.

12. ATHANASIUS, Bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 328. "In these benefits thou wast immersed, (baptized,) O newly enlightened; the initiation into the grace, O newly enlightened, has become to thee an earnest of resurrection: thou hast the immersion (baptism) as a surety of the abode in heaven. Thou didst imitate, in the sinking down, the burial of the Master; but thou didst rise again from thence, before

works witnessing the works of the resurrection." *Conant*, Ex. 187.

"The child sinks down thrice in the font and comes up. This shows the death and resurrection, on the third day, of Christ." *Ib.* Ex. 188.

"In like manner with the immersion (baptism) the fountain of tears cleanses men. Wherefore many, having defiled the holy immersion (baptism) by offences, were cleansed by tears and declared just." *Ib.* Ex. 233.

"Three immersions (baptisms) purgative of all sin whatever, God has bestowed on the nature of men. I mean that of water; and again that by witness of one's own blood; and, thirdly, that by tears, in which the harlot was cleansed." *Ib.* Ex. 234.

In both the above examples, and also in one quoted by Dr. Rice (Debate, p. 159) from Clement of Alexandria, a backslider "baptized a second time with tears," the word *baptized* is used in a highly figurative sense. Not literally baptized in tears he shed, but figuratively. We say a person is *drowned* in tears, to denote excessive weeping. This is a highly figurative or hyperbolical expression. Not literally drowned in tears. One has said, "if they were immersed in tears, they must have been big ones." It would take as big ones to *drown* them as to immerse them; yet this is a common expression —drowned in tears, immersed in grief, plunged in grief. If you make it mean *sprinkled* with tears,

it destroys the hyperbole, takes away all the *force* of the expression, and renders it tame and insipid. It means *overwhelmed* in grief.

JEROME, born A.D. 331. "First they teach all nations, and, when they are taught, dip them in water." *Westlake*, Ch. 8.

"And thrice we are immersed (ter mergimur) that there may appear one sacrament of the trinity." *Conant*, Ex. 214.

14. AMBROSE, Bishop of Milan, born A. D. 340. "The body was plunged into this water, to wash away sin; the Holy Ghost descended upon this water, &c. Thou wast asked, 'Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty?' Thou saidst, 'I do believe,' and wast dipped, (mersiti,) that is, buried, (sepultus est.)" *Orchard's Hist.* p. 44; also *Conant's Ex.* 209.

"Yesterday we discoursed respecting the font whose appearance is, as it were, a form of sepulchre, into which, believing in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, we are received and submerged, and rise, that is, are restored to life." *Conant Ex.* 210. So also in Examples 211, 212, 213.

15. GREGORY, Bishop of Neo-Cæsarea, about A. D. 240, in his Panegyric on Origen, says: "He himself would remain on high in safety, and, stretching out a hand to others, save them, as if drawing up persons submerged, (baptized.) *Ib. Ex.* 44.

16. GREGORY NAZIANZUS, born A. D. 328. "Nor

let us take more lading than we are able to carry; that we may not be immerged (baptized) vessel and men, and make shipwreck of the grace, losing all because we hoped for more." *Ib.* Ex. 90.

"Let us therefore be buried with Christ by the immersion, (baptism,) that we may also rise with him; let us go down with him, that we may also be exalted with him." *Ib.* Ex. 189.

17. CYRIL, Bishop of Jerusalem, A. D. 350. "As he who is plunged in the water and baptized, is encompassed by the water on every side, so they that are baptized by the Spirit are also wholly covered all over." *Pengilly*, p. 75; *Ib.* Ex. 180.

"Thou, going down into the water, and in a manner buried in the waters, as he in the rock, art raised again, walking in newness of life." *Ib.* Ex. 176.

"Ye professed the saving profession, and sank down thrice into the water, and again came up, and there by a symbol shadowing forth the burial of Christ." *Ib.* Ex. 178.

"Simon the Magian, once came to the bath. He was immersed, (baptized,) but he was not enlightened; and the body indeed he dipped into water, but the heart he did not enlighten by the Spirit. And the body went down indeed, and came up; but the soul was not buried with Christ, nor was raised with him." *Ib.* Ex. 228.

Cyril, being the bishop of Jerusalem, had the best of opportunities for knowing how baptism had been

administered there from the days of the apostles. He does not seem to find any of the difficulties in immersing people at Jerusalem, which so many advocates of sprinkling suggest. Wesley says, "They had none but the gentle waters of Siloam." *Doctrinal Tracts*, p. 245.

Mr. Wesley seems to have forgotten the vast pools and reservoirs. Cyril found no lack of water for immersing at Jerusalem.

18. Basil the Great, born A. D. 330, Bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, in 370, "Imitating the burial of Christ, by the immersion (baptism) for the bodies of those immersed (baptized) or buried in water." *Conant*, Ex. 181.

"By three immersions we represent the death of Christ." *Adkinson, Bap.* p. 127.

"By three immersions the great mystery of baptism is accomplished." *Pengilly*, p. 75.

"The water presents the image of death, receiving the body as in a tomb." *Conant*, Ex. 182; also, 183, 184, 185, 186, 218.

Dr. Rice quotes from Dr. Pond on Bap. a passage from Basil, (C. and R. Debate, p. 159,) of "a martyr baptized into Christ with his own blood." Dr. Rice inquires, "Were the martyrs immersed in their own blood?"

Well, we have seen how Basil understood the ordinance of baptism. He says the bodies of those baptized were *buried in water*. The *water receives the body as in a tomb*. When Basil spoke of one

baptized in blood, he meant immersed in blood; not literally but hyperbolically or figuratively as *drowned* in tears, plunged in martyrdom, and blood. We speak of a land drenched in blood, not literally but figuratively. If you mean simply *sprinkled* with blood, the expression becomes utterly tame, and entirely fails to convey the idea of overwhelming suffering. Sprinkled in martyrdom! Sprinkled in blood, sprinkled in suffering! How does David speak of great trials and sorrow? Ps. lxix. 2, "I am come into deep waters where the floods overflow me." Ps. xlii. 6, 7, "O my God, my soul is cast down within me,—all thy waves and thy billows are gone over me,"—the idea of a complete immersion. So, plunged in martyrdom and blood.

Dr. Rice (Debate p. 158, also, Rice on Bap., 108) quotes from Wall's Hist. a passage from Origen. "How came you to think that Elias, when he should come, would baptize, who did not, in Ahab's time, baptize the wood upon the altar, which was to be washed before it was burnt, by the Lord's appearing in fire? But he ordered the priests to do that: not once only, but says, do it the second time, and they did it the second time."

Dr. Rice thinks this a clear case of baptism by pouring. Let us see. Turn to 1 Kings xviii. 33—35. "And he put the wood in order, and cut the bullock in pieces and laid him on the wood, and said, Fill four barrels with water and pour it on the burnt sacrifice and on the wood. And he said Do it the

second time And they did it the second time. And he said Do it the third time, and they did it the third time. And the water ran round about the altar, and he filled the trench also with water." It is said, the water was poured on the wood. But how much? Twelve barrels. Was it not completely *covered over* with water? Four barrels at a time, and repeated three times. Was it not *overwhelmed* in water? This was what added to the glory of the miracle when fire consumed the sacrifice, the wood, the stones, the dust and the water. If a man is put under the sheet of water which pours over Niagara Falls, will he not be *immersed* even by pouring? If Dr. Rice will pour four barrels of water upon his candidate and repeat it three times, it will do tolerably well for immersion. I think, however, the candidate would prefer to be immersed in the old-fashioned way, before the administrator got through. We say the sun *pours* its light upon the earth. Are we immersed in the light when surrounded by it on every side? or are we only sprinkled or poured with light? The air pours through the door and fills the room. Are we immersed in the air, or are we only sprinkled or poured?

Yet these examples from Origen, Clement, Basil and Athanasius are the very best Dr. Rice can find in the Christian Fathers, after the most extensive research, to aid him in the cause of sprinkling; and these utterly fail him, and give their emphatic testimony in favor of immersion as the meaning of the

word. The passages referred to lose all their force, dignity and expression, unless you understand the word to mean immersion.

Why does not Dr. Rice bring a long array of passages from the Fathers to prove that they understood *baptizo* to mean only the sprinkling of a few drops, or to the pouring of a gill of water upon a person? Simply because a solitary passage of the kind cannot be found in any of the early Christian writers. On the other hand, we produce scores of passages from the early Christian writers, showing beyond all question that they understood *baptizo* to mean immerse, and that baptism was immersion.

19. HELIODORUS, Bishop of Tricca, in Thessaly, wrote about A. D. 390. "Already becoming immerged (baptized) and wanting little of sinking, some of the pirates at first attempted to leave and go on board of their own bark." *Conant*, Ex. 39.

"Slaying, some on land and plunging (baptizing) others into the lake." *Ib.* Ex. 81.

"Wholly absorbed in grief and whelmed (baptized) by the calamity." *Conant, Ib.* 108. "Whelmed (baptized) with him in his grief." *Ib.* Ex. 109. "The occurrences still whelmed (baptized) you." *Ib.* Ex. 110.

"When midnight had plunged (baptized) the city in sleep." *Ib.* Ex. 121.

20. CHRYSOSTOM. Born A. D. 347, and became patriarch of Constantinople in 398. "To be baptized and to submerge, then to emerge, is a symbol

of descent to the grave and of ascent from it." *Stuart on Bap.* p. 147.

"He who is controlled by that love, and sustained by the hope of that good, is whelmed (baptized) by none of the present evils." *Conant,* Ex. 104.

"Whelmed (baptized) by troubles." *Ib.* Ex. 105.

"The evils did not whelm (baptize) him." *Ib.* Ex. 106.

"Whelmed (baptized) in grief." *Ib.* Ex. 109.

"Whelmed (baptized) by the calamity." *Ib.* Ex. 108.

"If blessed David, therefore, being king and whelmed (baptized) with ten thousand cares, called on God seven times a day," &c. *Ib.* Ex. 123.

"How were we immersed (baptized) in wickedness, so that we could not be cleansed but needed regeneration." *Ib.* Ex. 129.

"Whelmed (baptized) with ten thousand sins." *Ib.* Ex. 130.

"Job, neither whelmed (baptized) by poverty." *Ib.* Ex. 138.

"A ship that has become filled with water is soon submerged (baptized)." *Ib.* Ex. 158.

"For as his body, buried in the earth, bore for fruit the salvation of the world, so also ours, buried in the immersion, (baptism,) bore for fruit righteousness, sanctification," &c. *Ib.* Ex. 186.

"For as he who is immersed (baptized) with water, rises again with great ease, not at all hindered by the nature of the waters," &c. *Ib.* Ex. 229.

21. Augustine, born A. D. 354. "After you professed your belief, three times did we submerge (demersimus) your heads in the sacred fountain." *Stuart on Bap.* p. 147.

22. Apostolical Canons, written as early as the fifth century. "If a bishop, or presbyter, shall not perform three immersions (baptisms) for one initiation, but one immersion (baptism) that given into the death of the Lord, let him be deposed." *Conant*, Ex. 235.

23. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria in 412. "We are immersed (baptized) not into fire perceptible by the senses, but into the Holy Spirit, like fire consuming away the pollution in souls." *Conant*, Ex. 222; also, 223.

In harmony with the foregoing, also, numerous examples might be given from Theodoret, born A. D. 393, and John of Damascus, born about A. D. 700; Alcuin and Theophylact. The work of Dr. Conant gives a vast number of examples from the classics and the early Christian writers, all confirming the meaning of baptizo to be immersion, and never sprinkling or pouring.

Prof. Stuart justly remarks: "The passages which refer to immersion are so numerous in the Fathers, that it would take a little volume merely to recite them." *Stuart on Bap.* p. 147. "But enough. 'It is,' says Augusti, 'a thing made out,' viz., the ancient practice of immersion. So, indeed, all the writers who have thoroughly investigated this sub-

ject conclude. I know of no one usage of ancient times which seems to be more clearly made out. I cannot see how it is possible for any candid man who examines the subject to deny this." *Ib.* p. 149.

But if sprinkling and pouring were the practice in the days of Christ and the apostles, and baptizo meant to sprinkle and pour, how happens it that learned men like Dr. Rice and Prof. Stuart do not bring us numerous passages from the early Christian writers, saying that baptism was the sprinkling of a few drops of water or pouring of a little on the candidate? Would it require a small volume merely to recite such passages from the Fathers? A very small one indeed! Yet if such testimony could be found, surely Dr. Rice and Prof. Stuart would have produced it, for they seem to have gone through the whole range of the classics and Fathers in search of something to sustain sprinkling. They search, but they find not.

CHAPTER XI.

TRANSLATIONS OF THE BIBLE.

Table of translations—Fourteen versions of the first eight centuries either translate it immerse or transfer it—Fifty versions presented—Dr. Rice on the Peshito Syriac, *amad*—Syriac Lexicons say it means immerse—Rice on the German version and *taufen* — Testimony of Luther, that *tauff* means immersion — German Lexicons—Dr. Rice's statements refuted—The translations sustain our views and refute sprinkling.

We may learn how Christians have understood the word *baptizo* by their translations of the Bible. If they understood it to mean immerse, they would translate it by a word that meant to immerse; if to sprinkle, by a word that meant to sprinkle. Some of the versions do not translate the word, but transfer baptizo into the other language, as in our common English version. The following table will give the reader a distinct view of this subject.

VERSION.	DATE.	WORD.	MEANING.
SYRIAC—			
Peshito,	2d century,	amad,	immerse.
Philoxenian,	6th cent.,	amad,	immerse.
ARABIC—			
Polyglot,	7th cent.,(?)	amada,	immerse.
Propaganda,	1671,	amada,	immerse.
Sabat,	1816,	amada,	immerse.

VERSION.	DATE.	WORD.	MEANING.
PERSIC—	1341,	shustan & shuyidan,	wash.
Modern(Martyn)	1812,	shastanah and ghusl,	ablution.
Modern(Martyn)	1812,	deriv. of amad,	immerse.
ETHIOPIC—	4th cent.,	tamaka,	immerse.
Amharic,	1822,	tamaka,	immerse.
ARMENIAN—	4th or 5th c.,	mugurdel,	immerse.
Modern,	1805,	mugurdel,	immerse.
GEORGIAN—	8th cent.,	nathlistemad,	immerse.
EGYPTIAN—			
Coptic,	3d cent.,	tomas,	immerse.
Sahidic,	2d cent.,	baptize.	
Basmuric,	3d cent.,	baptize.	
SCLAVONIC—	9th cent.,	krestiti,	to cross.
Russian,	1519,	The same root, krestiti, to cross.	All who use these versions practice immersion only.
Polish,	1585,		
Bohemian,	1593,		
Lithuanian,	1660,		
Livonian or Lettish,	1685,		
Dorpat Esthonian,	1727,		
TURKISH—	1666,	deriv. of amad,	immerse.
TARTAR—	modern,	amad,	immerse.
GOTHIC—	4th cent.,	daupjan,	dip.
German,	1522,	taufen,	dip.
Danish,	1524,	dobe,	dip.
Swedish,	1534,	dopa,	dip.
Dutch,	1560,	doopen,	dip.
HELVETIC—	1604,	taufen,	dip.
Jewish German,	modern,	taufen,	dip.
Lower Saxon,	1530,	taufen,	dip.
Flemish,	1475,	doopen,	dip.
ICELANDIC—	1584,	skira,	cleanse.
ANGLO-SAXON—	8th cent.,	dyppan, fullian,	dip, cleanse.
HEBREW—	1599,	taval,	immerse.
Polish Hebrew,	modern,	taval,	immerse.

VERSION.	DATE.	WORD.	MEANING.
LATIN—			
Of the early Fathers,	2d cent.,	tingo,	immerse.
Ante-Higronymian,	3d cent.,	baptizo.	
Vulgate,	4th cent.,	baptizo.	
FRENCH—	1535,	baptizer.	
SPANISH—	1556,	bautizar.	
ITALIAN—	1562,	battezare.	
ROMANESE—	modern,	deriv. of baptizo.	
PORTUGUESE—	modern,	deriv. of baptizo.	
WELSH—	1567,	bedyddio,	bathe.
IRISH—	1602,	baisdim.	
GAELIC—	1767,	baisdeam,	dip.
ENGLISH—			
Wickliffe,	1380,	wash, christen, baptize.	
Tyndale,	1526,	baptize.	

From the foregoing table it will be seen that six translations of the Bible were made during the first three hundred years from the birth of Christ. These were the Peshito Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic, Basmuric, the first and second Latin. During the next five hundred years eight more translations were made, namely, the Philoxenian, Arabic, Ethiopic, Armenian, Georgian, Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, and Latin Vulgate: making fourteen versions in the first eight hundred years. Four of them simply transfer the word *baptize*. The ten versions which translate the word, render it by a word which signifies *immerse*. This is a most significant fact. *Not one* of the translations of the Bible in the first eight hundred years render it *sprinkle* or pour, while all

the versions made in that time render it by a word which means to *immerse*, or transfers the word itself, which Prof. Stuart says the early churches understood to mean immerse. Who can possibly account for these things, if the primitive churches practiced sprinkling and pouring for baptism?

This testimony for immersion as the primitive baptism, and immerse as the meaning of the word, is most conclusive.

The next version was the Sclavonic, made in the ninth century, in which it was rendered *to cross*, because during the ceremony the priest made the sign of the cross. This, of course, is no translation of the word *baptizo*. But the people who used that version *always* practice immersion, and declare that nothing else is baptism.

The foregoing table gives the rendering of *baptizo* in fifty versions. In ten of these the word baptize is itself used, and not translated. In seven Sclavonic or Russian dialects it is rendered *to cross;* but the Russian or Greek Church always practices immersion, and their theological writers insist that the word *baptizo* never means anything but immerse. Of the remaining thirty-three translations, four render it to wash, cleanse or bathe, all which is done most completely by immersion. The remaining twenty-nine versions all render it by a word which signifies to dip or immerse. *Not one* of the fifty translations renders it by a word which signifies to *sprinkle* or *pour*.

Dr. Rice has given his attention to the translations of the Bible. He does not hesitate to make the sweeping assertion that none of them render it by a word which signifies to immerse. But the reader will know how much confidence to place in such sweeping assertions when we have examined his arguments on the two principal ones on which he speaks, the Peshito Syriac and the German. Of course he has selected the two translations which he thinks look least like immersion. Let us examine them.

1. The Peshito Syriac version, made in the first half of the second century, renders *baptizo* by *amad*. Dr. Rice insists that *amad* means to *stand* or to *confirm*. Every one can see at a glance, that to *stand* or to *confirm* is not a translation of baptizo. They are not baptism at all, in any sense. Hence it is a perfect absurdity to suppose the word baptizo translated by a word which signifies to *stand*. Yet this is Dr. Rice's subterfuge to avoid the conclusion that *amad* means *immerse*. But what say the Syriac lexicons in regard to the meaning of *amad?* I will produce the testimony of four, the best and most reliable in existence.

Schaaf's *Lex. Syr.* sub. vc. Lyons, 1708, defines *amad* "*abluit se, ablutus, intinctus, immersus in aquam; baptisatus est,*" to bathe one's self, to bathe, dip, immerse into water, baptize. This is the very lexicon which Dr. Rice uses. He himself translates the Latin definitions given above, "he washed

himself, was washed, stained, *immersed in water*, was baptized." Yet Dr. Rice must still argue against his own lexicons, and say it does not mean immerse, but—to stand!!!

MICHAELIS' *Lex. Syr.*, Gottingen, 1788, defines it thus: "*Ablutus est, baptizalus est, immersit,*" to bathe, baptize, immerse.

GUIDO FABRICIUS' *Lex. Syro. Chal.*, accompanying the Antwerp Polyglot, sub. vc. Antwerp, 1592, defines it thus: "*Baptizavit, intinxit lavit,*" to baptize, dip, bathe.

BUXTORF'S *Lex. Chal. et Syr.*, Basle, 1662, defines it: "*baptizari, intingi, ablui, abluere se,*" baptize, dip, bathe one's self.

Beza, after remarking that baptizo properly means to immerse, and never to *wash*, except as a consequence of immersion, says, "Nec alia est significatio verbi *amad* quo utuntur Syri pro baptizari;" *nor is there any other signification of the word* AMAD which the Syrians use for BAPTIZO. *Ap. to Stuart*, p. 249.

2. THE GERMAN version made by Martin Luther in 1522, translates *baptizo* by *taufen.*

Dr. Rice says, (Debate, p. 126,) "He has said that Luther translated *baptizo* by a German word signifying to immerse. That this statement is incorrect, is evident from Luther's translation of Matt. iii. 11. 'I indeed baptize you *mit wasser*—with water,' not *in* water. 'He shall baptize you *with* (mit) the Holy Ghost, and *with* (*mit*) fire.' Can any one believe that Luther so translated this passage as to

make John the Baptist say—'I immerse you *with* water?' Luther, and the German ministers who used his translation, practiced baptizing by pouring or sprinkling. Did they render themselves perfectly ridiculous by standing up and saying, 'I *immerse* thee,' &c., and then sprinkling water on the person? It is absolutely incredible. No sensible man would act such a farce."

Yet even this would not be quite so ridiculous as Dr. Rice would make the Syrian minister appear who should adopt his interpretation of *amad*, "I stand thee!!" or, "I make thee stand!!" &c. That would be "absolutely incredible. No sensible man would act such a farce."

Dr. Rice says his remarks on Luther's version are also true of the Dutch, Danish, and Swedish translations, and then adds, "Not one of these versions translates the word *immerse*. And the people who read them, it is well known, have never practiced immersion." These last two sentences Dr. Rice has left out of his late work on baptism, where he speaks of Luther's version on p. 106. He has probably become convinced that they are not true.

Let us hear Luther's own testimony on this matter as to the meaning of *baptizo*, and also *taufen*, with which he translates it.

LUTHER'S Works, vol. i. p. 72, Witeberg, 1582, or Walch ed. vol. x. pp. 25, 93. "The term baptism is a Greek word; it may be rendered into Latin by *mersio*—when we immerse a thing in water that it

may be *entirely covered* with water. And though that custom be quite abolished among the generality, (for neither do they entirely dip children, but only sprinkle them with a little water,) nevertheless they ought to be wholly immersed, and immediately to be drawn out again; for the etymology of the word seems to require it. The Germans call baptism *tauff*, from depth, which they call *tieff*, in their language; as if it were proper those should be deeply immersed who are baptized. And truly, if you consider what baptism signifies, you shall see the same thing required; for it signifies that the old man and our native character that is full of sin, entirely of flesh and blood as it is, may be overwhelmed by divine grace. The mode of baptism, therefore, ought to answer to the signification of baptism, so that it may show forth a sign that is certain and full." *Hague's Second Reply to Cooke and Towne*, p. 23.

Let us also hear what the German dictionaries say of the meaning of *taufen*.

Heinsius' large German Dictionary, 4 vols. Hanover, 1822. "*Taufen* signifies, in a general sense, to plunge into water or other fluid (as a bomb dipped (*getauft*) in pitch and rosin:) in a more limited sense, to immerse in water in a religious way. In the Christian Church, to wet one with water in a solemn manner as a sign of purification, and thereby receive him into the fellowship of Christians." This last sentence clearly implies that the *practice* of the Germans is not in conformity with the *meaning of the*

word which he had before defined. It is therefore a definition of the *practice* of the Germans and not of the *meaning* of *taufen*.

KALTSCHMIDT'S German Lex. 4to. Leipsic, 1834. "*Taufen*, to immerse, (eintauchen,) to consecrate to Christianity, to name." He subsequently defines the *practice* and not the word.

SMILTHENNER'S Etymological Dic., 1834. "*Taufen*, in old German *toufian*, from *toufa*, which signifies *tiefe* (i. e. deep;) consequently it means to immerse."

SCHWENCK'S Etymological Dic., 3d edition, 1838. "*Taufen*, to immerse in water; specially, to purify with water for admission to the Christian Church. *Taufen* is the same (etymologically) as *tauchen*," i. e. to dip.

GENTHE'S German Synonyms, 1838. "*Tauchen* and *taufen* were originally the same. The act expressed by *taufen* was performed by immersion (untertauchen). At present the word *taufen* retains its proper signification, to overwhelm with water."

WIEGAND'S German Synonyms. "*Taufen*, originally equivalent to *untertauchen*, (to dip under,) signifies, in its religious use, *to immerse in water*."

For the above authorities see Dr. Cushman's work, "A Pure Christianity the World's only Hope," pp. 35, 36.

KNAPP'S Theology, vol. ii. p. 501, the work of a great German scholar, translated and republished at Andover. "*Baptisma*, from baptizein, which properly

signifies *to immerse*, like the German *taufen*, to dip in, to wash by immersion."

Such is the testimony on the German word *taufen*, by which Luther translated *baptizo*. Yet Dr. Rice says it does not mean *immerse!* Well, Dr. Rice selected the Peshito Syraic and the German versions as those which he thought least sustained our views. How signally he has failed to show that *amad* and *taufen* do not mean immerse. This failure in his attack on what he regarded the weakest point of our argument from the translations of the Bible, only shows more conspicuously the impregnable strength of our position. The translations triumphantly confirm our views, and utterly refute those of Dr. Rice and all the advocates of sprinkling. What must the candid reader think, then, of Dr. Rice's sweeping assertion that not one of the translations renders baptizo by a word meaning immerse? He seems to rely on bold and reckless assertions instead of proof. A righteous cause would scorn such a resort. Truth needs no such means of defence. That cause must be desperate which drives such a man to such measures.

The following are specimens of the recklessness of Dr. Rice's assertions, all of which have been fully disproved:—

Rice on Bap., pp. 114, 115. "The Greek classics employ these words (bapto and baptizo) in different senses, expressive of dipping, wetting, washing, and

even sprinkling." Where is the example in proof? Not one can be found.

"The Jews in their sacred writings, canonical and apocryphal, use these words in the sense of dipping, wetting, moistening, washing, cleansing; and in almost every case where *baptizo* is used, the circumstances and the context prove that the application of water by pouring or sprinkling is intended." Not one such example can be found!

"All the most valuable translations, ancient and modern, either transfer the word *baptizo* or translate it by a *generic* word expressive of the meaning and design of baptism, but not the mode." The foregoing chapter utterly disproves this, and shows the contrary.

"The Christian Fathers, Greek and Latin, used *baptizo* constantly, to signify the application of water or blood by pouring or sprinkling." Where can specimens of more RECKLESS and *unfounded* assertion be found! Dr. Rice, who substitutes *sprinkling* for *baptism*, substitutes such *assertions* instead of *proof* to sustain it.

CHAPTER XII.

BAPTIZO CANNOT MEAN TO SPRINKLE, POUR, OR PURIFY.

Substitution of *baptize* for *pour*, for sprinkle—Sprinkle, pour, and wash substituted for baptize—Immerse substituted for baptize—Queer meanings sought by Pedobaptists—Baptists increase, though persecuted—Teachings of the Bible plain on baptism—Duty to refute error—Baptizo does not mean purify—Dr. Beecher refuted—The classics do not use it to mean purify—Nor do the Christian Fathers—Nor does the Bible.

I WILL make it plain to every English scholar, and to every child, that baptizo does *not* mean to *sprinkle* or to *pour*. If it does, then we can substitute *baptize* for the words *sprinkle* and *pour* where they occur in the Bible, and it will still read correctly and make good sense. Let us see if it means *pour*. Substitute *baptize* for *pour* in the following passages:—

Gen. xxviii. 18. Jacob *poured* oil on the stone.

Jacob *baptized* oil on the stone! Did Jacob *baptize* the oil? He poured it.

Exod. ix. 83. Rain was not *poured* on the earth.

Rain was not *baptized* on the earth.

Levit. xiv. 41. They shall *pour* out the dust. They shall *baptize* out the dust.

Ps. lxii. 8. *Pour* out your heart for him. *Baptize* out your heart before him.

Joel ii. 28, and Acts ii. 17, 18. I will *pour* out my Spirit upon all flesh. *Baptize* out my Spirit!

Ps. lxxix. 6. *Pour* out thy wrath upon the heathen. *Baptize* out thy wrath upon the heathen!

Matt. xxvi. 7. Mary *poured* the ointment on his head. *Baptized* the ointment on his head!

John ii. 15. Jesus *poured* out the changer's money. *Baptized* out the changer's money!

You see plainly that *baptize* cannot mean to *pour*. Does it mean to *sprinkle*? Substitute *baptize* for *sprinkle* in the following passages and see.

Ex. ix. 10. Moses *sprinkled* the ashes up toward heaven. *Baptized* the ashes up toward heaven!

Ezek. xxxvi. 25. I will *sprinkle* clean water upon you. *Baptize* clean water upon you!

Job ii. 12. *Sprinkled* dust upon their heads. *Baptized* dust upon their heads!

Heb. ix. 13. The ashes of an heifer *sprinkling* the unclean. The ashes of an heifer *baptizing* the unclean!

It is plain to see that baptize cannot mean to sprinkle. To substitute it in place of sprinkle does violence to the language, and renders the passage absurd.

It would be equally absurd to substitute sprinkle, pour or wash, in many places where baptize occurs in the New Testament. Try it.

Mat. iii. 1. In those days came John the *sprinkler, pourer,* or *washer!*

6. And were sprinkled, poured, washed of him in Jordan, confessing their sins! 7. But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his sprinkling, pouring, washing!

11. I indeed sprinkle, pour, wash you in water, (*en hudati* in the original,) he shall sprinkle, pour, wash you in the Holy Ghost and in fire. The original reads *in* the Holy Ghost and *in* fire. The same preposition *en* as is used in the first verse,—*in* those days, *in* the wilderness, &c.

16. And Jesus when he was sprinkled, poured, washed, went up straightway out of the water!

Luke xii. 50. I have a sprinkling, pouring, washing, to be sprinkled, poured, washed with, &c.!

Rom. vi. 4. Buried with him by sprinkling, pouring, washing! Col. ii. 12. Buried with him in sprinkling, pouring, washing!

John iii. 23. John was sprinkling, pouring, washing in Enon, because there was much water there!

But will not the passages read correctly and make good sense if we substitute *immerse* in place of baptize?

Mat. iii. 1. In those days came John the Baptist (immerser.) 6. And were immersed of him in Jordan.

11. I indeed immerse you in water. He shall immerse you in the Holy Ghost and in fire.

16. And Jesus when he was immersed came up straightway out of the water.

Luke xii. 50. I have an immersion to be immersed with.

Rom. vi. 4. Buried with him by immersion. Col. ii. 12. Buried with him in immersion.

This reads correctly and makes good sense. This agrees with all the lexicons, the classics and the early Christian writers. The Bible was written for plain men, in a plain style, that men might at a glance get its meaning. When men read about baptism in the New Testament, baptized in the river Jordan, "*all* baptized of him in the river of Jordan," (Mark i. 5) — going down into the water — coming up out of the water,—buried in baptism, &c., they get the idea of immersion,—just what all the lexicons say the word means.

But I have heard it argued that Baptists were more numerous in the Southern States, where general intelligence and learning are less diffused, than in the Northern and New England States, — and that there were more Pedobaptists in the North than in the South.

This argument reminds me of a story told by the Rev. Dr. W——, now of New York. Travelling in Kentucky, he stopped at a blacksmith shop to get his horse shod. Meeting there a negro slave who was a Baptist, Dr. W——, said, "Tom, how is it that so many of you negroes are Baptists, while your masters are Methodists, Presbyterians, or

Episcopalians?" Tom replied, "Well, massa, it is dis way. We niggers have to work most all de time, and when we read de Bible, we have to take it *just as it reads*, for we have no time to hunt up *queer meanings*."

If learned men would spend less time in hunting up *queer meanings*, and take it just as it reads, they would often come much nearer the truth and avoid many errors. This country was originally settled by Pedobaptists, who would not even permit a Baptist to live in their settlements. In New England Colonies, Baptists were fined, whipped, imprisoned and banished for their sentiments. In Virginia they were also cruelly persecuted, and imprisoned. But since they first began to preach in the United States, they have made constant and rapid progress, until they now far outnumber those denominations which once persecuted them.

In the newer States, where men are less fettered by old prejudices and long established associations, and where men are not only more free to investigate, but more free to carry out their convictions of conscience, Baptists have, perhaps, increased more rapidly than in some other localities. But in the thoroughness of scholarship in our institutions of learning, and in the erudition of our educated men, we yield the palm to no others upon this continent.

Yet, so plain are the teachings of the Bible upon the subject of baptism, that we could well afford to let the public mind decide as to this duty by simply

reading the Bible without note or comment. But the unwearied efforts of such men as Dr. Rice and a multitude of feebler advocates of sprinkling; their almost countless perversions of Scripture; their bold and unfounded assertions, make it necessary for us occasionally to meet and refute them. This is neither a pleasant nor difficult task. But it is one from which we do not shrink.

BAPTIZO DOES NOT MEAN TO PURIFY.

Baptize does not mean *to purify*, as Dr. Edward Beecher has so strenuously endeavored to show. A few passages from the classics, and from the early Christian writers, who certainly understood the sense in which the word was used in the New Testament, will set this point entirely at rest. Take the following from the classics:

HIPPOCRATES. "Shall I not laugh at the man who *purifies* (baptizes) his ship by overloading it?"

ARISTOTLE. "Places beyond the pillars of Hercules which, when it is ebb tide, are not *purified* (baptized)."

EVENUS. "He (Bacchus) *purifies* (baptizes) with a sleep near to death."

HELIODORUS. "When midnight *purifies* (baptizes) the city with sleep."

DIODORUS SICULUS. "Most of the land animals that are intercepted by the river [Nile] perish, being *purified* (baptized)." "They *purify* (baptize) their subjects with taxes."

PLUTARCH. "*Purified* (baptized) by worldly affairs."

ACHILLES TATIUS. "*Purified* (baptized) with a multitude of evils."

JOSEPHUS. "*Purified* (baptized) by drunkenness into stupor and sleep." "*Purified* (baptized) in ignorance."

PROCLUS. "The Io-Bacchus was sung at festivals and sacrifices of Bacchus, *purified* (baptized) in much wantonness."

The classical writers surely did not use it to mean *purify*, but to plunge, overwhelm. The consequence of the plunging might be purification or pollution. The word *baptizo* only expresses the act, and not the consequence.

The following passages from the earliest Christian writers show most conclusively that they did not understand it to mean *purify*, but to plunge, dip, overwhelm.

BASIL. "As wool is *purified* (baptized) in a dye." "The bodies of those *purified* (baptized) are buried in water."

JUSTIN MARTYR. "*Purified* (baptized) with most grievous sins."

CLEMENT of Alexandria. "*Purified* (baptized) by drunkenness into sleep." "*Purified* (baptized) in ignorance." "They *purify* (baptize) from sobriety into fornication."

ORIGEN. "*Purified* (baptized) by wickedness."

AMBROSE. "Thou wast *purified,* (mersisti,) that is, buried."

CHRYSOSTOM "David *purified* (baptized) by ten thousand cares." "How were we *purified* (baptized) with ten thousand sins?"

These examples prove that the early Christian writers did not use the word baptizo to mean purify. Prof. Stuart says, "That the Greek Fathers, and the Latin ones who were familiar with the Greek, understood the usual import of the word, would hardly seem capable of denial." Page 154. "The passages which refer to immersion are so numerous in the Fathers, that it would take a little volume merely to recite them." Page 147. "In what sense did the churches of Christ, from a very early period, to say the least, understand the word baptizo? Plainly they construed it as meaning immersion."

How strangely would the Scriptures read, to substitute *purify* instead of *baptize.* Luke xii. 50, "I have a *purification* to be *purified* with." Rom. vi. 4, "Therefore we are buried with him by *purification.*" Matt. iii. 13, "Then cometh Jesus to be *purified.*" 16, "Jesus when he was *purified* came up straightway out of the water." John iii. 22, "There he tarried and *purified.*" 23, "John was *purifying* in Enon because there was much water there." Gal. iii. 27, "As many as were *purified* into Jesus Christ."

Dr. Beecher's theory, that *baptizo* means to *purify,* is in direct conflict with the classical writers,

the Scriptures themselves, and all the early Christian writers. It cannot be true. Prof. Stuart says of it, "The theory is very beautiful; *but it wants bottom.*" *Baptismal Balance,* p. 58.

To say that *baptize* means to *purify,* and therefore any mode of purification is baptism, is utterly absurd. We *purify* metals by *melting* them. We *purify* the blood by *taking pills.* We *purify* the air of a room by *ventilating.* Are these all modes of baptism? They are modes of purifying.

CHAPTER XIII.

HISTORICAL EVIDENCE.

Pedobaptists say immersion was the primitive baptism—Knapp—Pictet—Dr. Chalmers—Encyclopedia Ecclesiastica—Dr. Wall—Dr. Campbell—Bishop Bossuet—Stackhouse—Whaley—Bishop Smith—Mosheim—Mastricht—Dr. Cave—Alstedius—Morus—Confession of Helvetia—Magdeburg Cent.—Dr. Gregory—Wolfius—Chambers' Encycl.—Jerome—Keckermannus—Curcellius—Calvin—Bingham—Towerson—Salmasius—Grotius—Vitringa—Vossius—Bowers—Lightfoot and Clarke—Storr and Flatt—Luther—Gurney—Stuart and Augusti—Bunsen—Penn—Mede—Altmannus—Bishop Taylor—Burmannus—Le Clerc—Piscator—Heidanus—Zanchius—Estius—Deylingius—Ypeij and Dermont—Dupin—Schaaf—Beausobre—Camerarius—Dr. King—Castellio—Daille—Rees' Cycl.—Hahn—New Am. Encycl.—Neander.

THE testimony of the best theological writers and historians of various denominations, ages, and countries, upon the meaning of the word *baptizo*, and the practice of the primitive churches, is worthy of grave consideration; especially since many of them are constrained to give testimony which is not in harmony with their own practice. This they would not do, unless truth, sustained by the plainest evidence, compelled them to do it. Many who thus frankly acknowledge that the ordinance has been

changed from immersion to sprinkling and pouring, claim that the Church has the right to change it, and thus excuse themselves for this acknowledged departure from the word of God. But no man has a right to change the ordinances of God. If *baptizo* means *immerse*, that is the duty which God enjoined, and not sprinkling nor pouring.

1. Dr. Geo. C. Knapp's Theology, translated by Leonard Woods, Jun. of Andover, vol. ii. p. 516. "Immersion is peculiarly agreeable to the institution of Christ and to the practice of the apostolical church; and so even John baptized, and immersion remained common for a long time; except that in the third century, or perhaps earlier, the baptism of the sick (baptisma clinicorum) was performed by sprinkling or affusion. Still some would not acknowledge this to be true baptism, and a controversy arose concerning it — *so unheard of* was it, at that time, to baptize by simple affusion. *Cyprian first* defended baptism by sprinkling when necessity called for it, but cautiously and with much limitation. By degrees, however, this mode of baptism became more customary, probably because it was found more convenient; especially was this the case after the seventh century, and in the Western Church. But it did not become universal until the commencement of the fourteenth century. Yet Thomas Aquinas had approved this *innovation* more than a hundred years before. In the Greek and Eastern Church they still held to immersion.

It would have been better to have adhered generally to the *ancient practice*, as even Luther and Calvin allowed."

2. PICTET's Theology, published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia, p. 411. "This baptism it was lawful to perform in rivers, lakes, and fountains, or in other receptacles of water, but nowhere else. And they immersed the whole body, in order that the baptized might be accounted a child of the covenant.—Now John the Baptist administered this rite among the Jews in the manner above described."

3. DR. CHALMERS, on Rom. vi. 4. "The original meaning of the word baptism is immersion; and though we regard it as a point of indifferency whether the ordinance so named be performed in this way or by sprinkling, yet we doubt not that the prevalent style of administration in the apostles' days was by an actual submerging of the whole body under water. We advert to this, for the purpose of throwing light on the analogy that is instituted in these verses. Jesus Christ by death underwent this sort of baptism—even immersion under the surface of the ground, whence he soon emerged again by his resurrection. We by being baptized into his death, are conceived to have made a similar translation. In the act of descending under the water of baptism, to have resigned an old life," &c.

4. ENCYCLOPEDIA ECCLESIASTICA. 'It is evident that during the first ages of the Church, and for

many centuries afterwards, the practice of immersion prevailed; and which seems indeed never to be departed from, except where it was administered to a person at the point of death, or upon the bed of sickness — which was considered as not giving the full privileges of baptism — or when there was not a sufficient supply of water. Except in the above cases, the custom was to dip or immerse the whole body. Hence St. Barnabas says, 'We go down into the water.'" *Pengilly*, p. 76.

5. Dr. Wall's *History of Infant Baptism*, Part ii. ch. ix. § 2. "This [immersion] is so plain and clear by an infinite number of passages, that as one cannot but pity the weak endeavors of such Pedobaptists as would maintain the negative of it, so we ought to disown and show a dislike to the profane scoffs which some people give to the English Anti-Pedobaptists, merely for the use of dipping, when in all probability it was the way in which our blessed Saviour, and for certain was the most usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians did receive their baptism. It is a great *want of prudence*, as well as of *honesty*, to refuse to grant to an adversary what is certainly true, and may be proved so. It creates a jealousy of all the rest that one says." *Pengilly*, p. 76.

6. Prof. George Campbell, of Scotland, Lect. on Pulpit Eloquence, Lect. x. p. 304. "I have heard a disputant, in defiance of all etymology and use, maintain that the word rendered in the New Testa-

word *Baptize* means more properly to sprinkle than to plunge, and *in defiance of all antiquity*, that the former was the earliest, and the most general practice in baptizing. One who argues in this manner, never fails, with persons of knowledge, *to betray the cause he would defend;* and though with respect to the vulgar, bold assertions generally succeed as well as argument, and sometimes better, yet a candid mind will always disdain to take the help of *falsehood even in the support of truth*." *Pengilly*, p. 76.

7. Bishop Bossuet. Variations du Protestantisme, vol. iii. p. 410 et seq., edition of Lyons, 1827. "The decision of [the council of] Constance, to approve and to retain the communion in one kind, is one of those which our adversaries imagine give them the greatest advantage. But in order to understand the gravity and steadfastness of the Church in that decree, we have only to recollect that the council of Constance, when it ordered it, found the custom of communing in one kind established without contradiction for several centuries. It was much in the same case as was baptism by immersion, which is as clearly established in Scripture as the communion in two kinds could be, and which had nevertheless been changed to pouring, with as much ease and as little contradiction as the communion in one kind had been established, so that there was the same reason for retaining the one as the other. It is a fact *invariably admitted* by the Reform, although certain individuals are at present disposed to cavil

about it, that baptism was instituted by entirely immersing the body; that Jesus Christ so received it, and caused it to be so administered by his apostles; that the Scripture knows no other baptism; that antiquity so understood and practiced it; that the very word carries with it the idea, and that to *baptize* is to *immerse:* this fact, I say, is unanimously confessed by all the theologians of the Reform, by the Reformers themselves, and by the very persons who best knew the Greek tongue and the ancient customs of both Jews and Christians, by Luther, by Melancthon, by Calvin, by Casaubon, by Grotius, by all the others, and very recently by Jurien, the fondest of contradiction of all the ministers." *Willard.*

Also, p. 391, same vol. "We have seen the illusions of the Anabaptists, (Baptists,) and we know that it was by carrying out the principles of Luther and of the other Reformers that they rejected baptism without immersion, and the baptism of infants; because they did not find them in the Scriptures, where they had been told everything was."

8. STACKHOUSE's History of the Bible, P. 8, p. 1234. "Several authors have shown and proved that this immersion continued as much as possible to be used for thirteen hundred years after Christ." *Pengilly,* p. 77.

9. DR. WHALEY's Comment. on Rom. vi. 4. "It being so expressly declared here that we are *buried* with Christ in baptism, by being buried under

water; and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death, by dying to sin, being taken hence; and *this immersion being religiously observed by all* Christians for thirteen centuries, and approved by our Churches, and the change of it into sprinkling, even without any allowance from the Author of this institution, or any license from any council of the Church, being that which the Romanist still urges to justify his refusal of the cup to the laity; it were to be wished that this custom might be again of general use, and aspersion only permitted, as of old, in cases of the clinici, or in present danger of death." *Pengilly*, p. 47.

10. Bishop Smith, Bishop of the Prot. Episcopal Church of Kentucky. "We have only to go back six or eight hundred years, and immersion was the only mode, except in case of the few baptized on their beds when death was near. And with regard to such cases, it disqualified its recipients for holy orders in case he recovered. Immersion was not only universal six or eight hundred years ago, but it was primitive and apostolic, no case of baptism standing on record by *any* other mode for the first three hundred years, except the few cases of those baptized clinically, that is, lying in bed. If any one practice of the early Church is clearly established, it is immersion." *Bliss' Letters on Bap.* p. 24.

11. Mosheim's Church History, (Maclaine's,) vol. i. p. 46. "The sacrament of baptism was administered in this century (first) without the public as-

semblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by an immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font."

Vol. i. p. 69. "The persons to be baptized [in the second century] after they had repeated the Creed, confessed and renounced their sins, and particularly the devil and all his pompous allurements, were immersed under water, and received into Christ's kingdom by a solemn invocation of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to the express command of our blessed Lord."

Vol. i. p. 121. [Fourth century.] "Baptismal fonts were now erected in the porch of each church, for the more commodious administration of that initiating sacrament."

Vol. ii. p. 127. "The true origin of that sect which acquired the denomination of Anabaptists by their administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion, and derived that of *Mennonites* from the famous man to whom they owe the greatest part of their present felicity, is hidden in the depths of antiquity, and is, of consequence, extremely difficult to be ascertained."

12. MASTRICHT. "Immersion was used by the apostles and primitive Churches, because it was not only more agreeable in warm countries, but also more significant." *Westlake's Gen. View*, ch. 4.

13. DR. CAVE, Chaplain of King Charles II. "The party to be baptized was wholly immersed or put under water, whereby they did more notably and

significantly express the three great ends and effects of baptism." *Ibid.* ch. 4.

14. ALSTEDIUS, Prof. of Theology at Weissemberg, 1630. "The rite of immersion which is intimated by the very word baptism, certainly bears a greater analogy to the thing signified." *Ib.*

15. M. MORUS. "Baptism was formerly celebrated by plunging the whole body in water." *Ib.*

16. CONFESSION OF HELVETIA. "John dipped Christ in the water in Jordon." *Ib.* ch. v.

17. MAGDEBURG CENTURIATORS. "The Son of God was dipped in the water of Jordan, by the hand of John the Baptist." *Ib.*

18. DR. GREGORY. "The initiatory rite of baptism was [in the first century] publicly performed by immersing the whole body." *Ib.*

19. WOLFIUS. "That baptismal immersion was practiced in the first ages of the Christian Church, many have shown from the writings of the ancients." *Ib.*

20. CHAMBERS' CYCLOPEDIA. "In the primitive times, this ceremony (baptism) was performed by immersion, as it is to this day in the Oriental churches, according to the original signification of the word." *Ib.*

21. JEROME. Born A. D. 331. "First they teach all nations, and, when they are taught, dip them in water." *Ib.* ch. viii.

22. KECKERMANNUS' System. Theolog. L. 3, c. 8, p. 369. "We cannot deny that the first institution

of baptism consisted in immersion, and not sprinkling." *Judson on Bap.* p. 11.

23. CURCELLIUS. "Baptism was performed by plunging the whole body into water, and not by sprinkling a few drops, as is now the practice. Nor did the disciples that were sent out by Christ administer baptism afterwards *in any other way.*" Relig. Christ. Institut. L. 5, c. 2. *Judson*, p. 23.

24. CALVIN, on John iii. 23, and Comment. on Acts viii. 38. "From these words, John iii. 23, it may be inferred that baptism was administered by John and Christ, by plunging the whole body under water. Here we perceive how baptism was administered among the ancients; for they immersed the whole body in water." *Judson*, p. 24.

25. BINGHAM'S Origines Eccles. B. xi. c. xi. "As this [immersion] was the *original apostolic practice, so it continued to be the universal practice of the Church*, for many ages, upon the same symbolical reasons as it was first used by the apostles." *Ib.* p. 25.

26. DR. TOWERSON'S Sacram. of Bap. Part iii. p. 58. "But, therefore, as there is so much the more reason to represent the rite of immersion as *the only legitimate rite of baptism*, because *the only one* that can answer the ends of its institution, and those things which were to be signified by it; so especially, if *(as is well known and undoubtedly of great force)* the general practice of the primitive Church was agreeable thereto, and the practice of the Greek Church to this very day." *Ib.* p. 25.

27. Salmasius, Prof. in University of Leyden, 1632, author of eighty printed works. "The ancients did not baptize otherwise than by immersion, either once or thrice; except clinics, or persons confined to their beds, who were baptized in a manner of which they were capable; not in the entire laver, as those who plunge the head under water, but the whole body had water poured upon it. Thus Novatian, when sick, received baptism, being *perichutheis, poured about*, not *baptistheis, baptized*." *Ib.* p. 27.

28. Grotius, one of the most eminent scholars of Holland. "That baptism used to be performed by immersion, and not by pouring, appears both from the proper signification of the word and the places chosen for the administration of the rite, John iii. 23; Acts viii. 38; and also from the many allusions of the apostles, which cannot be referred to sprinkling, Rom. vi. 3, 4; Col. ii. 12." *Ib.* p. 23.

29. Vitringa. "The act of baptizing is the immersion of believers in water. This expresses the force of the word. Thus, also, it was performed by Christ and the apostles." *Ib.*

The historical testimony of early Christian writers might be repeated here. For such, see pp. 106–119 of this work.

30. J. G. Vossius. "That the apostles immersed whom they baptized, there is no doubt,—and that the ancient Church followed their example is very

clearly evinced by innumerable testimonies of the Fathers." *Pengilly*, 75.

31. Bower's Hist. of the Popes, vol. ii. p. 110. "Baptism by immersion was undoubtedly the apostolical practice, and was never dispensed with by the Church, except in cases of sickness." *Ib.*

32. Dr. Lightfoot and Adam Clarke, in A. Clarke's Commentary at the end of Mark. "That the baptism of John was by *plunging* the body, (after the same manner as the washing unclean persons was,) seems to appear from those things which are related of him, namely: that he *baptized in Jordan*, that he baptized in Enon because there was much water there." *Ib.* p. 15.

33. Doctors Storr and Flatt's Theology, translated by Dr. Schmucker, and published at Andover, vol. ii. p. 291. "Moreover the old custom of immersion was also retained a long time in the Western Church, at least in the case of those who were not indisposed. And even after aspersion had been fully introduced in a part of the Western churches, there yet remained several who for some time adhered to the ancient custom. Under these circumstances, it is certainly to be lamented that Luther was not able to accomplish his wish with regard to the introduction of immersion in baptism, as he had done in the restoration of wine in the Eucharist."

34. Martin Luther's works, vol. ii. p. 76, ed. 1551. "On this account (as a symbol of death and resurrection) I could wish that such as are to be

baptized should be completely immersed into water, according to the meaning of the word, and according to the signification of the ordinance, not because I think it necessary, but because it would be beautiful to have a full and perfect sign of so perfect a thing; as also *without doubt* it was instituted by Christ." *I. Chase, D.D., on Bap.* p. 50.

35. Joseph John Gurney's Observ. on Peculiarities of Friends, p. 73. "Although the baptism practiced by John and by the apostles did not in all its circumstances resemble those Jewish washings to which I have now adverted; yet it was precisely similar to them in the main particular of *immersion* in water." *Haynes' Bap. Denomination*, p. 137.

36. Prof. Stuart and Augusti. "'It is,' says Augusti, 'a thing made out,' namely, the ancient practice of immersion. So, indeed, all the writers who have thoroughly investigated this subject conclude. I know of no usage of ancient times which seems to be more clearly made out. I cannot see how it is possible for any candid man who examines the subject to deny this." *Stuart on Bap.* p. 149.

37. Dr. Bunsen's Hippolytus, vol. ii. p. 179. "The candidate for baptism was immersed in water and admitted as a brother, upon his confession of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." *Curtis' Prog. Bap. Prin.* p. 114.

38. William Penn. "There is not one text of Scripture to prove that sprinkling in the face was water baptism, or that children were the subjects

of water baptism in the first times." *Westlake*, ch. 7.

39. Joseph Mede, Greek Lecturer in Cambridge University, England, in 1632. "There was no such thing as sprinkling used in baptism in the apostles' times, nor many ages after them." *Ib.* ch. v.

40. Altmannus. "In the primitive Church, persons to be baptized were not sprinkled, but entirely immersed in water." *Maclay's Address in Glasgow*, p. 10.

41. Bishop Jeremy Taylor. "The custom of the ancient churches was not sprinkling but immersion, in pursuance of the sense of the word in the commandment and the example of our blessed Saviour." *Pengilly*, p. 18.

42. Burmannus, Prof. of Divinity at Utrecht, born at Leyden, 1632. "Immersion was used by the Jews, the apostles, and the primitive Church. To this, various forms of speaking, used by the apostles, refer, Rom. vi. 4." *Frey on Bap.* p. 131.

43. LeClerc's Remarks sur Nouv. Test. Matt. iii. 1. "John has been called the Baptizer, rather than the Baptist. It is an appellation to signify a man that *plunged* in water those who testified an acknowledgment of his divine mission, and were desirous of leading a new life." *Frey on Bap.* p. 139.

44. Piscator. "*Hudata polla* signifies many rivers, as *hudor* in the singular number denoted the river Jordan. This is mentioned to signify the ceremony of baptism which John used; i. e. *immersing*

the whole body of a person standing in the river. Whence Christ, being baptized by John in Jordan, is said to ascend out of the water. The same manner was observed by Philip, Acts viii. 38." *Ib.*

45. HEIDANUS. "That John the Baptist and the apostles immersed, there is no doubt, whose example the ancient Church followed, as is most evident from the testimony of the Fathers." *Ib.*

46. ZANCHIUS. "The ancient Church used to immerse those that were baptized. Thus Christ went down into the Jordan and was baptized, as also others were baptized by John." *Ib.* 142.

47. ESTIUS. "The ceremony of immersion was anciently more common, as appears from the unanimous language of the Fathers as often as they speak about baptism." *Ib.*

48. DEYLINGIUS. "It is manifest that while the apostles lived, the ordinance of baptism was administered not by sprinkling but by immersion."

49. DR. YPEIJ, Prof. of Theol., Groningen, and DR. J. J. DERMONT, chaplain to the King of the Netherlands, in their History of the Dutch Baptists, say, "We have now seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses, and who have long in the history of the Church received the honor of that origin. On this account, the Baptists may be considered *the only Christian community which has stood since the days of the apostles*, and, as a Christian society, has preserved pure the doc-

trines of the gospel through all ages. The perfectly correct external and internal economy of the Baptist denomination tends to confirm the truth disputed by the Romish Church that the Reformation brought about in the sixteenth century was in the highest degree necessary, and at the same time goes to refute the erroneous notion of the Catholics, that their communion is the most ancient." *Encycl. Rel. Knowledge*, Art. Mennonites.

50. Dupin's Hist. Cent. 3. "They generally dipped them thrice in water, invoking the name of the Trinity." *Orchard's Hist.* p. 35.

51. Dr. Philip Schaaf, Prof Theol. Sem., Mercersburg, Pa., in his Hist. Apostolic Church, p. 568. "Immersion and not sprinkling was unquestionably the original, normal form [of baptism]. This is shown by the very meaning of the Greek words *baptizo*, *baptisma*, and *baptismos*, used to designate the rite." *Theodosia*, vol. i. p. 165.

52. Beausobre, a Prussian translator and commentator, born 1657. Note on Matt. iii. 2. "Baptism was at first performed by plunging the whole body in water."

53. Dr. J. G. King. "The Greek Church uniformly practice trine immersion, undoubtedly the most primitive manner." *Hinton's Hist. Bap.* p. 180.

54. Camerarius' Comment. on Matt. iii. 6. "*And were baptized*; that is, they were immersed in water." *Booth's Ped. Ex.*

55. Castellio, Prof. of Greek at Basle, and an

intimate friend of Calvin, A. D. 1545, Comment. on Matt. iii. 6. "And *were baptized*; that is, they were immersed." *Ib.*

56. John Daille, Protestant minister in Paris, 1594–1670, De usu Patrum. "It was the custom heretofore in the ancient Church to plunge those baptized over head and ears in water. This is still the practice of both the Greek and Russian Churches even at this very day.

57. Rees' Cyclopedia. "In the primitive times this ceremony was performed by immersion, as it is to this day in the Oriental churches, according to the original signification of the word." *Everts' Law of Bap.* p. 34.

58. Hahn. "According to apostolic institution and example, baptism was performed by immersing the whole man." *Ib.* pp. 40, 41.

59. New American Encyclopedia. Art. Baptism. "The form of baptism at first was, according to most historians, by immersion; but as Christianity advanced into colder climates, the more convenient mode of sprinkling was introduced." *Ib.* p. 33.

Same work, Art. Baptists. "The fact (that the immersion of adults was the primitive baptism) is generally admitted by works of scientific authority, both historical and archæological." "It is well known that all the Greek and Oriental churches (with a population of one hundred millions) though adopting the baptism of children, retain immersion

to this day, as essential to the validity of the rite, and, as Bunsen remarks, deny that there is any efficacy in the Western form of baptism."

60. NEANDER. "In respect to the form of baptism, it was, in conformity with the *original institution and the original import of the symbol*, performed by immersion." *Church Hist.* vol. i. p. 310.

61. GESENIUS, the author of the best Hebrew lexicon extant, on being told that the American Baptists practiced immersion, said, "They are right. That is the ancient mode."

62. DR. H. A. W. MEYER, remarks on "*was baptized of John in Jordan.*" "It expresses the idea of *immersion.*" *Wiberg on Bap.* p. 28.

63. OTTO VON GERLACH. "'I baptize you in water;' the Greek word (baptizo) properly signifies dip. Baptism was performed in the first times of Christianity by *immersion* in water." *Ib.* p. 32.

It would be easy to enlarge the list of witnesses upon the historical evidence that immerse is the meaning of *baptizo*, and that immersion was the practice of the primitive churches. But many of them are quoted in other parts of this work, and need not be repeated here. The testimony, however, is as full and decisive as can be furnished upon any historical fact whatever. No candid man who examines the subject can deny it.

CHAPTER XIV.

JOHN'S BAPTISM.

Efforts to put John's baptism out of the gospel dispensation useless —The Scriptures against it—Various objections answered—Rebaptism in Acts xix.—Mode of John's baptism—In Jordan—Bethabara—*With* water *in* water—Much water—Enon—Use of the much water for baptizing—*Pol'a hudata,* its meaning, Scripture proofs—The number baptized by John—Pedobaptist views —Scriptures opposed to those views—John baptized fewer than Jesus—Dr. Peters and Dr. Guyse.

MANY advocates for sprinkling have shown no little anxiety to prove that John's baptism was not under the gospel dispensation, and was not Christian baptism. Why is this, unless there is something in the circumstances attending it which strongly favors immersion?

But if we admit that it was not under the gospel dispensation, that does not affect the argument. We are inquiring what was the act of baptism. John *baptized.* The apostles *baptized.* They performed the same act. If John's baptism was immersion, so was Paul's and Peter's; for the same word *baptize* expresses the same act, whether performed by John, Paul, or Peter.

Yet Dr. Hibbard, the Methodist writer on bap-

tism, says, "The mode of John's baptism can have no direct tendency to fix the evangelical mode of Christian baptism, any further than to throw light upon the use and application of the word *baptize*." Vol. ii. p. 11.

The act expressed by the word *baptize* was the same, by whomsoever the act was performed. If John's baptism shows that the act was immersion, it also shows that the baptism of Christ and the apostles was immersion.

But in their efforts to put John's baptism out of the gospel dispensation, they array themselves against the plain declarations of the Scripture.

Says Dr. Peters, p. 52, "The legal dispensation, indeed, was in full force during all the time of John's ministry and the personal ministry of Christ, and came to its close only in the death and resurrection of the Saviour, after which, as we have seen, Christian baptism was instituted."

How flatly he contradicts the Bible! Luke xvi. 16. "The law and the prophets were *until John:* since that time *the kingdom of God* is preached and every man presseth into it." How could a truth be plainer? The gospel kingdom commenced with the preaching of John the Baptist. Up to that time the old dispensation had continued, but no longer. Even if the passage meant, as it evidently does not, that the law and the prophets continued until the *death* of John, and then the gospel kingdom commenced, it would still put the commence-

ment of the gospel kingdom some time previous to the death of Christ; for John was beheaded some two years before the death of Christ, if we credit Dr. Hibbard's account of the brevity of John's ministry. Dr. Peters says the legal dispensation continued until the resurrection of Christ. Jesus himself says it did not, but continued *until* John.

Says Jesus, (Matt. xi. 12, 13,) "From the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force. For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John." How could they take it if it had not yet come? Matt. xii. 28, "The kingdom of God is come unto you." Luke xi. 20, "The kingdom of God is come upon you." But Mark calls the preaching of John the beginning of the gospel. Mark i. 1–4, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God; as it is written in the prophets, Behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." Here we have Jesus several times declaring it, and Mark declaring that John's ministry was under the gospel dispensation; but many of the advocates of sprinkling contradict them all. Also Mark i. 14, 15, "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the *kingdom of God*,

and saying the *time is fulfilled;* and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the *gospel.*" Luke iv. 43, "I must preach the *kingdom of God* to other cities also." Luke ix. 2, "He sent them (the twelve) to preach the *kingdom of God.*"

If it be said that John's baptism was not Christian baptism because it was instituted before the resurrection of Christ, the same argument would prove that the *Supper* was not a Christian ordinance because *it* was instituted before the resurrection of Christ.

It is repeatedly declared that the *gospel* was preached during the ministry of John and of Christ. Was it not, then, the gospel dispensation? If *Christ's own ministry* was not under the *Christian* dispensation, what can constitute the Christian dispensation?

Matt. iv. 23. Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the *gospel of the kingdom.*

Matt. xi. 5. The poor have the *gospel* preached to them.

Luke ix. 6. And they departed and went through the towns preaching the *gospel,* and healing everywhere.

Some have objected to John's ministry being under the gospel dispensation, because it is said that John was a prophet. But were there not prophets under the gospel dispensation? 1 Cor. xi. 4, "Every man praying or *prophesying* with his head un-

covered, dishonoreth his head." 1 Thess. v. 20, "Despise not *prophesyings*." Acts xi. 27, "And in those days came *prophets* from Jerusalem unto Antioch." Acts xiii. 1, "Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain *prophets* and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon, Lucius, and Manaen." Acts xv. 32, "Judas and Silas, being *prophets*." Was not Paul's ministry under the gospel dispensation? Yet he gave directions that men should prophecy with their heads uncovered. Did not Barnabas, and Simeon, and Silas, labor under the gospel dispensation? Yet they are all called prophets. So was John the Baptist a gospel minister, as well as a prophet.

But it has been objected that John did not baptize in the name of the Trinity. This cannot be proved. John was sent of *God* to baptize. His special object was to prepare the way of the *Lord*, the Son of God, the Messiah, and he expressly taught the people to "believe on him which should come after him, that is, on *Christ Jesus*." Acts xix. 4. And John was "filled with the *Holy Ghost* from his mother's womb." Luke i. 15. Who can say, then, with assurance, that he did not baptize in the name of the Trinity? He did what God commanded him; and by the absence of the formula which he used, God has taught us that it is not important that we should know it, else it would have been recorded. The absence of his formula of baptism cannot place his ministry out of the gospel dis-

pensation, when the Scriptures so expressly declare that it was the beginning of the gospel dispensation. In not a single instance is it said that any were baptized in the name of the Trinity; yet they doubtless were, because this was commanded. On the day of Pentecost, Peter told them to be baptized in the *name of Jesus Christ.* Were they not baptized in the name of the Trinity?

The case recorded in Acts xix. 1–5, where it is supposed Paul rebaptized some who had been baptized unto John's baptism, is often presented as proof that John's baptism was not Christian baptism. The passage reads, "Paul having passed through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus; and finding certain disciples, he said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what, then, were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus."

Dr. Peters says on the above passage, (p. 54,) "As to any recognition of the Holy Ghost in John's baptism, some whom *he had baptized*, themselves affirmed, 'We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.' So Paul baptized them

in the name of the Lord Jesus, paying no regard to their having been baptized *by John*." Dr. Peters insists that they had been baptized by *John*, but the record simply says, "Unto John's baptism." Now, it is evident that John himself did not baptize them. John had been dead more than twenty-five years when Paul met these men. If John himself had baptized them, they could not have said, "*We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost*," for John was full of the Holy Ghost from his birth, and he expressly taught that Jesus should baptize with the Holy Ghost.

The whole record shows clearly that, somebody who had but very imperfectly learned something about the baptism of John, had baptized them before they had learned the first principles of spiritual religion; before they knew there was any Holy Ghost. But when Paul preached to them the full gospel, and they received it, they were baptized. It is evident that they were not fit subjects of baptism in any sense when they did not know there was any Holy Ghost. Alas that ministers should even now pretend to baptize persons in infancy, before they know there is any Holy Ghost! A large number of those whom I have baptized on a profession of their faith are of that very class, whom somebody had pretended to baptize in infancy, before they knew there was any Holy Ghost, or had learned anything of Jesus Christ, or God, or heaven or hell. I have Paul's authority and example for

rebaptizing such. This rebaptism, in no degree, questions the validity of John's baptism. These persons were not proper subjects of John's baptism, nor of any other, until they knew there was a Holy Ghost. Hence, when they were really converted, it was proper that they should be baptized.

And you, dear reader, if you were baptized before you knew there was any Holy Ghost, ought to come out and be baptized whenever you are converted to Christ. Here is the Bible authority for it.

If Christian baptism was not instituted until after the resurrection of Christ, then the apostles themselves had not received Christian baptism when they administered it to others. Who can believe they would thus act?

But Pedobaptists, though they labor so strenuously to place John's baptism out of the gospel dispensation, are after all constrained to discuss

THE MODE OF JOHN'S BAPTISM.

Where did John baptize? In the river Jordan, and in Enon, because there was much water there. Matt. iii. 5, 6, "Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." Mark i. 5, "There went out to him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." Mark i. 9, 10, "Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in

Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened," &c.

Such narratives carry with them the plain impression that the baptism was not the sprinkling of a few drops of water, but something which made it *necessary* for them to go into the river. When it is explicitly said that they were *all* baptized in the river Jordan, it conveys the idea that their baptism was something which rendered it *essential* that they should go into the water. Else why did it not say, some were baptized in the Jordan, some on the bank, and some out of a bowl of water? It was not necessary for them to go into the river in order to sprinkling or pouring, but it was necessary for an immersion. People sometimes, in our day, go into a river and are sprinkled, or have a little water poured on them; but on every such occasion, the public mind is impressed with the unreasonableness and folly of such a procedure. Did they commit such folly under the teachings of John the Baptist, who was full of the Holy Ghost? Surely not. It must have been necessary for them to go into the river or they would not have gone. Nothing but immersion made it necessary. Sprinkling and pouring certainly did not.

Some have said that *en*, in, does not tell how deep. No, but it tells enough: in the Jordan, and Paul says, "We are *buried* in baptism." What else but immersion can answer to this description? "To teach immersion, it should mean *under*." Under

the Jordan! That would be below the bottom. I have been *under* the Lackawanna river, in Pennsylvania, in a coal mine, but was not immersed in the river. The Bible has it just right to indicate immersion *in* the Jordan.

It is truly astonishing how the advocates of sprinkling have quibbled over these prepositions in, *en*, into, *eis*, out of, *ek*, and *apo*. Here is one specimen from a tract published by the Tract Soc. of the Methodist Episcopal Church. A. W. M'Leod on Baptism, p. 26. "By rendering *eis*, *into*, our Lord is made amphibious. John x. 40, 'Jesus went away again beyond Jordan into (*eis*) the place where John at first baptized, *and there he abode*.' Interpret this with Baptist strictness, and you make our Lord amphibious. 'For if John literally went *into* the water and baptized by immersion, and if our Saviour went into the *very place* where John baptized and *abode there*, it necessarily follows that the Redeemer must have lived principally in the water." There, is not that logic? Criticism run mad! Read John i. 28. "These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing." Bethabara was a village on the east bank of the Jordan, situated at the common ford of the river. John baptized in the river there, and yet baptized at Bethabara, just as a minister might baptize in the Mississippi at St. Louis, or Alton, and a witness of the event would speak of it as done in St. Louis or Alton. A friend of mine resides in Alton, where

I once saw several persons immersed. Does this prove that my friend is *amphibious?* and that the friend lives in the *very place*, the *very spot*, where the candidates were immersed? No, indeed. But the immersion was only a few steps from my friend's house. Bethabara was an admirable locality for immersion. It may have been a pleasant place of residence too, even for one who was not *amphibious*. A cause which needs such childish quibbling to sustain it must be weak indeed.

How strenuously many have urged, in favor of sprinkling, the passage Matt. iii. 11, "I indeed baptize you *with* water. He shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost and *with* fire." They insist that the baptism was *with* water, not *in* water. But the passage in the inspired original Greek reads *in water*, (*en hudati*) *in the Holy Ghost*, (*en hagio pneumati*) and *fire*, (*puri.*) It is so rendered in Dr. Geo. Campbell's Notes, (Presbyterian,) Andover edition, vol. ii. p. 20. Note on Matt. iii. 11, "In water, in the Holy Spirit. The word baptism both in sacred authors and in classical signifies to dip, to plunge, to immerse. It is always construed suitably to this meaning."

Robinson's Greek Lexicon of the New Testament, p. 126, gives the same rendering of this passage, *in* the Spirit, *in* fire. This is direct proof *against* sprinkling and pouring, and in favor of immersion. *En*, the preposition before *water* and *Spirit* in this verse, is the same that is translated *in* in several other

verses of the same chapter. 1. *In* those days came John the Baptist preaching *in* the wilderness. 3. The voice of one crying *in* the wilderness. 6. Were baptized *in* the Jordan. 9. Think not to say *within* yourselves. 11. I baptize you *en* water, he shall baptize you *en* Holy Spirit and fire. 12. Whose fan is *in* his hand. How would it read to translate it *with* in these verses. *With* those days came John the Baptist preaching *with* the wilderness! The voice of one crying *with* the wilderness! It must mean *in* water, *in* the Spirit.

MUCH WATER.

John iii. 23. "John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there; and they came and were baptized." This passage plainly indicates immersion. "The use of the water here is not left to conjecture. It is specifically mentioned: it was for the very purpose of baptism," says Carson, p. 345. Much water was not necessary for sprinkling, nor for pouring. But it is necessary for immersion. How strangely Pedobaptists talk about this passage!

Says A. W. McLeod, the Methodist, p. 29, "Enon was *not* a place of much water, in the modern and accidental use of those terms; nor contained sufficient for those immersions which it is presumed took place in it."

Dr. Watson, the Methodist, says, "*Much water* or *many waters*, in the text, refers rather to the whole

tract of country." Watson on Bap. p. 60. The Bible says the much water was at Enon! Dr. Hibbard, another Methodist, says "It was the *quality*, not the *quantity* of water, that determined the baptismal station of John northward at Enon." *Hibbard on Bap.* vol. ii. pp. 13, 14. This contradicts the Scripture, which says he baptized there because there was *much* water, not because there was *pure* water. Dr. Hibbard would correct the diction of the Holy Ghost! Beware.

Dr. Fairchild, the Presbyterian, "Much water may be too shallow for immersion. To suit the construction of the Baptists, the Evangelist should have said John was baptizing at Enon because there was *deep* water there." Page 52. What say the Scriptures concerning that country? Gen. xiii. 10, "Lot lifted up his eyes and beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere." Deut. viii. 7, "The Lord thy God bringeth thee into a goodly land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and *depths* that spring out of valleys and hills."

The Congregational Magazine says, "The water was not necessary for *baptizing*, but for drinking, ordinary washings, cooking,—necessary not only for men, but for asses and camels." *Carson*, p. 345. This is the chief resort of Pedobaptists; they make the water necessary for everything but for *baptizing*, and say it was not necessary for that, while the Bible mentions *baptizing* as the *only* use of the water, and *baptizing* as the reason why John selected

a place of much water. As for the asses and camels, the Evangelist *does not mention any*,—they exist only in imagination; nor does the Evangelist mention any use of the water except for *baptizing*.

"The people followed our Lord on foot. Jesus preached everywhere, without any respect to the convenience of water, and to greater multitudes than came to John. When they came to Jesus to the most distant places without a supply of food, it is evident they did not intend to make a long stay. Why should they stay longer with John?" *Carson*, p. 345.

It is not said that the people *encamped* at Enon, or *abode* there. It simply says, "They came, and were baptized."

Great efforts have been made to show that the words *much water, (polla hudata,)* mean *many* waters, rather than *much* water; that is, many little springs or rivulets. Even if it meant this, it would inevitably afford suitable places for immersion. Many springs or rivulets in one locality unite together, and in places give abundant depth for immersion. I have immersed candidates in a stream whose general channel was so narrow that a man could easily jump across without wetting his feet; yet I found plenty of water for immersing. But the phrase *polla hudata* does not signify many springs or rivulets. In Rev. i. 15, we read, "His voice was as the sound of *many waters*." This is a part of a most grand and glorious representation

of our Saviour, who "had in his right hand seven stars, out of his mouth went a sharp two-edged sword, and his countenance was as the sun shining in his strength." His voice was as the sound of many waters, like the *roaring of the sea*, rather than the soft gurgling of springs or rivulets. Rev. xvii. 1, "I will show unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon *many waters*;" that is, the mystic Babylon, extending over many countries, as is said in v. 15, over "peoples and multitudes, and nations, and tongues." The idea of springs and rivulets here is out of the question. Rev. xiv. 2, "I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of *many waters*, and as the voice of a great thunder." Do springs and rivulets make a sound like a *great thunder?* or is it the vast and deep ocean, or a mighty torrent, which alone can do it? Rev. xix. 6, "I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of *many waters*, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying Alleluia."

A few passages from the Old Testament, (Septuagint,) where the phrase *polla hudata* occurs, will still further show its use by the sacred writers to denote a large *quantity* of water.

Ps. xciii. 4. "The Lord on high is mightier than the noise of *many waters*, (*hudatōn pollōn,*) yea, than the mighty waves of the *sea*."

Ps. lxxvii. 19. "Thy way is in the *sea*, and thy paths in the *great waters*."

Do such passages as these indicate little *springs*

and *rivulets* too shallow for immersion? Yet the advocates of sprinkling give the phrase *polla hudata, much water*, that meaning in John iii. 22, in order to evade the evidence which it affords in favor of immersion!

Prof. Stuart on Bap. pp. 93, 94. "I cannot divest myself of the impression that there seems to be something extravagant in the supposition that not only the plural *hudata*, which naturally designates a large quantity or many streams of water, but also *polla* should be employed, in order to designate a quantity of water sufficient for baptizing by immersion, when *any small rivulet would furnish abundant means for such a purpose.* I cannot avoid the belief that *hudata polla* is designed, as Beza says, to designate *many streams or rivulets.*"

Well, if *any small rivulet* would afford abundant means for immersion, there surely was more abunant means where there were "*many streams and rivulets.*" Prof. Stuart makes it mean much more than is necessary for immersion, while the other Pedobaptists will not allow that there was water enough for immersion. How doctors disagree, even when they are all pleading for sprinkling.

There is good reason to believe that Enon was on the Jordan.

Eusebius, an early writer of Church history, born in Palestine A. D. 270, speaks of Enon as a locality well known in his day. He says, "Enon, near to Alim, where John baptized, as in the gospel accord-

ing to John. And even at the present time the place is shown eight miles from Scythopolis towards the south, near to Salim and the Jordan."

JEROME, born A. D. 331, and who travelled in Palestine, says, "Enon near Salim, where John baptized, as it is written in the gospel according to John, and the place is now shown at the eighth milestone from Scythopolis, at the south, near Salim and the Jordan." *Chase on Bap.* p. 147.

The Scriptures nowhere speak of John *leaving* the Jordan. Enon was, according to these early writers, who had the best of opportunity to know its locality, situated on or near the Jordan, and the *much water* may have been the Jordon itself. Its locality is definitely fixed eight miles south of Scythopolis, or Bethshan, now called Beisan.

BURKHARDT, the traveller, says of Scythopolis, "The ancient town was watered by a river now called Moiet Bysan, (Waters of Beisan.") Burkhardt crossed the Jordan two hours (six or eight miles) south of Scythopolis or Beisan, and says, "The stream was eighty paces broad and three feet deep." He also speaks of "ruins" near where he crossed. *Chase,* 148.

LIEUT. LYNCH, in his expedition to the Dead Sea and Jordan, encamped at this locality April 14, 1848. Lieut. Dale, who was one of the expedition, went to Beisan. Lieut. Lynch says, "Following the ravine towards Beisan, he came to *quite a large* stream issuing directly from the base of a hill. Instead of

passing through the ruins of Beisan, he went north about a mile distant from them. He then came in sight of a magnificent valley, filled with the Pasha's tents and a thousand horses, all picketed out to graze."

So it seems there is water enough in that region, even away from the Jordon, for all that immense caravan which Pedobaptists say thronged John the Baptist. Was there not enough for immersion?

Lieut. Lynch, pp. 211–219, speaks thus of the Jordan, where Enon must have been located, according to Eusebius and Jerome: "The boats had little need of oars to propel them, for the current carried us along at the rate of from four to six knots an hour, the river, from its eccentric course, scarcely permitting a correct sketch of its topography to be taken. It curved and twisted north, south, east, and west, turning in the short space of half-an-hour to every point of the compass, seming as if desirous to prolong its luxuriant meanderings in the calm and silent valley. Here and there were spots of solemn beauty. The numerous birds sang with music strange and manifold. Above all, yet attuned to all, was the music of the river, gushing with a sound like that of shawms and cymbals. At times we issued from the shadow of a narrow and verdure-tented part of the stream into an open bend, where the rapids rattled and the light burst in, and birds sang their wildwood song."

Is not here a description of Enon and its surroundings which suggested to the Evangelist the

very words, *much water*, or *many waters*? In the midst of these very windings of the Jordan stood the ancient Enon, where John was baptizing, because there was *much water there*.

DODDRIDGE says, "Nothing surely can be more evident than that *polla hudata* signifies a large quantity of water, it being sometimes used for the Euphrates." *R. Fuller*, p. 56.

PROF. OLSHAUSEN says, "John baptized at Enon, because there was deep water there, convenient for immersing." Vol. ii. p. 101.

KUINOL says, "An abundance of water, so much that the human body could easily be immersed in it, according to the mode of baptism as then practiced." Vol. iii. p. 248.

TOWERSON says, "For what need would there have been of Baptists resorting to great confluxes of water, were it not that the baptism was to be performed by an immersion? A very little water, as we know it doth with us, sufficing for an effusion or sprinkling." *Pengilly*, p. 14.

LIGHTFOOT and ADAM CLARKE say, "The baptism of John was by plunging the body." See p. 156 *Clarke's Com.*, at the end of Mark.

But some have objected that no vast bodies of water like the sea which is alluded to in the passages from the Revelations and the Psalms, exists in that country. We do not pretend that there was as much water at Enon as is referred to in the other passages; but we do insist that there was much water there,

enough for immersion. Pedobaptists contradict one another, and contradict the Scripture, in trying to evade the testimony of this verse in favor of immersion.

THE NUMBER BAPTIZED BY JOHN.

In order to get rid of the idea of immersion in John's baptism, Pedobaptists have assigned him so many candidates, that they think he could not have immersed them all.

Dr. Cooke and Mr. Towne say, "More than a million flocked to John's baptism. We put it down at five hundred thousand, as the least that could have been intended." *Strictures on Hague's Review*, p. 124.

Dr. Fairchild says, "If we suppose only a million of the Jews to have received the ordinance at his hands," &c. p. 54.

Dr. Peters and Dr. Hibbard say he must have baptized at least three millions, one half the population.

Dr. Peters says, pp. 76, 77, "He was perpetually attended by the greatest multitude that ever assembled around a human being for instruction." Says Dr. Hibbard, vol. ii. p. 19, "To make most *liberal* allowance in favor of our opponents, we will *suppose* John baptized one half the entire population of Palestine; it would then follow that he baptized, in all, three millions of persons." Dr. Hibbard then states his argument, p. 23. 1. "John baptized. in

all, three millions of persons. 2. The whole time in which John may be *supposed* to have been engaged in the very act of baptizing did not exceed one thousand three hundred and sixty-two hours. [Wonder he does not add on a few odd minutes and seconds] Therefore, John must have baptized, in one hour, two thousand two hundred and two; in one minute, thirty-six; or a little over one every two seconds. And he must have pursued these labors in the same rapid ratio during six hours per day, for the space of two hundred and twenty-seven days. Here then is an exposé of the real facts in the case."

Dr. Hibbard has a wonderful faculty of converting the wildest suppositions into the "*real facts* of the case." When he states the matter, he says only "we will *suppose* John baptized one half the population," and "The whole time in which John may be *supposed* to have been engaged," &c.; but he immediately adds, "here is an exposé of the *real facts* in the case." He has stated only his *suppositions*, and then, with unblushing audacity and recklessness, calls them facts. How can we trust such a man's statements or reasoning?

Let us look at this matter. John iv. 1, "Jesus made and baptized *more disciples than John.*" Now if John had baptized at least one half the entire population, where did Jesus find the *more* disciples for him to make and baptize? He then surely did not baptize half the population. But it is absurd to suppose that Jesus and John *both together* baptized

half the population; for John's disciples, as well as Jesus's, were taught to believe on Jesus Christ. Acts xix. 4. Yet the Scriptures say of Christ's reception by the Jews, "He came unto his own, and his own received him not." John i. 11. "No man [comparatively] receiveth his testimony." John iii. 32. "He is despised and *rejected* of men." Isa. liii. 3. In the parable of the nobleman, Luke xix. 14, he says, "His citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying, We will not have this man to reign over us." Rom. x. 21, "To Israel he saith, All day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people."

Now these are the *facts* in the case, and not *suppositions*. This is the testimony of Scripture in plain contradiction of Dr. Hibbard and the others. This clearly indicates that a comparatively small part of the *entire population* became either the disciples of John or Jesus.

If it be asked, "How then could the record say there went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan," common sense at once replies: "This surely means only that people from all classes and all places around came to him and were baptized." Bengel's New Testament says, "*all* is from *all parts*."

If you ask a person, just returned from a State fair, "Who was there?" he replies, "The whole State was there;" or, "The city and all the country

were there." Yet he does not mean, nor does any one of common sense understand him to mean, that *one-tenth* of the entire population of the State was there. The expression *Jerusalem* and *all Judea*, is a hyperbole, and is so understood by everybody except certain writers when they are opposing immersion.

A few thousands would probably number all the baptized disciples of both John and Jesus, previous to the day of Pentecost. On the day of Pentecost, the number of the disciples assembled together in Jerusalem is stated to be *about a hundred and twenty*, (Acts i. 15,) when it was the time of the great festival of the Jews, which called together not only the Jews of Palestine, but from distant countries extending from Mesopotamia to Rome, and from Arabia to Phrygia. Acts ii. 9–11. That only one hundred and twenty of Jesus' disciples were together at such a general gathering as Pentecost, is strange indeed, if they numbered more than three millions!

John baptized none but those *confessing their sins*. Hence he did not baptize the infants and little children of that portion of the population which came to his baptism. Infants and children generally constitute about one-half the population of a town or country.* But Dr. Hibbard makes no allowance for these. He counts them all in. But

* In countries where best cared for, those under fifteen years are, to the whole population, as 1 to 2·3

John *refused* to baptize many that came to his baptism. Matt. iii. 7, "When he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come! Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance." Others refused to be baptized by him. Luke vii. 30, "The Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him." Yet Dr. Hibbard thinks he has made *the most liberal allowance*, when he says John baptized one-half the entire population, at least three millions of persons!

Let us now state the case as the Scriptures represent it.

1. Jesus was despised and rejected of men, in general, his own received him not. No man, comparatively, received his testimony.

2. John made and baptized fewer disciples than Jesus. He baptized only penitents, confessing their sins. He refused to baptize many who came to him. Others, the Pharisees and lawyers, refused to be baptized by him. Therefore a few thousands would doubtless number all the baptized disciples of both Jesus and John, especially all who came from "Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins."

But, after all, it would take about as long to sprinkle them one by one, or to pour water on each, as

it would to immerse them. Dr. Peters says, (pp. 73, 74,) "It is clear, then, that he could not have *immersed* all the people that came to him. Yet it is expressly said that he *baptized them all.* It may be asked whether it was not equally impossible for John to baptize them according to our mode, that is, by sprinkling them one by one? Our reply is, that *it is not at all necessary to suppose that he baptized them singly.*" To help out Dr. Peters' idea, we add a quotation from

Dr. Guyse's Paraphrase of the New Testament, London, vol. i. p. 13. "It seems, therefore, to me, that the people stood in ranks, near to or just within the edge of the river; and John, passing along before them, cast water upon their heads or faces with his hands, or *some proper instrument*, by which means he might baptize many thousands in a day." Benedict, p. 256. Dr. Hibbard thinks they were sprinkled with a hyssop branch as they passed before him in ranks. Vol. ii. p. 26. We must let a poet reply to this grand argument:—

"The Jews in Jordan were baptized;
Ergo, ingenious John devised
A scoop, or squirt, or some such thing,
With which some water he might fling
Upon the long-extended rank
Of candidates that lined the bank:
Be careful, John, some drops may fall
From your rare instrument on all;
But point your engine ne'ertheless
To those who first their sins confess:

Let no revilers in the crowd
The holy sprinkling be allowed.
The Baptist had not time, we dream,
To dip the people in the stream."

Had it been necessary, could not John have had assistance? The Saviour baptized none himself, but his disciples did it, though it is said *Jesus* made and baptized more disciples than John. True, it is said they were baptized of *John* in Jordan. This does not preclude the assistance of others. It is also said, (Matt. xiv. 3,) "Herod laid hold on John, and bound him and put him in prison." Does this prove that Herod the king acted as *constable* on that occasion, and himself arrested John? If not, then the expression *baptized* of *him in Jordan* does not prove that John had no assistance in this work.

Dr. Fairchild, describing a baptism, on p. 72, says, "To *baptize* in his sense of the term, is to immerse the entire person of the candidate in water, and take him out again. All this must be done by a regularly ordained minister. But in the present instance, laymen took in the candidates and immersed them up to the waist. The minister did no more than dip their head and shoulders, and then lay persons took them out of the water. Thus not one of the forty-three received more than a half dipping from the hands of the preacher. If I were a strict immersionist, I would protest against the admission of these baptisms as valid."

I once heard a blustering sprinkler loudly de-

claiming on this point. He said, "If Baptists mean *immerse* by baptize, they utter a falsehood every time they say 'I baptize thee,' because they only immerse that part of the body that was above water. They can't get rid of it till the day of judgment!" Wonderful logic! Grand discovery! We lead them into the water, lay them under the water, and yet we do not immerse them! The preacher said we must carry them in, clear of the water, and plunge them all at once, in order to *immerse* them! Yet before he finished, he said he sometimes immersed candidates. Then, of course, *he* carries them in, clear of the water, and plunges them at once. If not, according to his own rule he utters a falsehood when he says *he* sometimes immerses persons.

We surely cannot fail to be struck with the multitude of wild conjectures, vague suppositions, and unworthy quibbles to which even learned men resort in order to evade the idea of immersion in John's baptism. Such a method of argumentation is not needed to sustain a just cause. The necessity of resorting to it is a sad confession of weakness. All the circumstances of John's baptism show that it was immersion.

CHAPTER XV.

HOW WAS JESUS BAPTIZED?

Scripture account of it—Looks like an immersion—Dr. Fairchild's comment—In Jordan—Christ's baptism an example—Quibbles upon *apo* refuted—Christ's own immersion shows *his* meaning of *baptizo*—Dr. Hibbard refuted—Fulfilling all righteousness—Jesus was not baptized to consecrate him a Jewish priest—Scriptures forbid the idea—Public mind believes Jesus was immersed—Lynch and the pilgrims to Jordan—Hibbard and Peters contradict the Saviour—Commentators.

THE following is the account which the New Testament gives of his baptism:—

Matt. iii. 13–17. "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering, said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: and lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

Mark i. 9–11. "Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan. And

straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon him: And there came a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

Luke iii. 21, 22. "Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass, that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened; And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased."

John's account is found in i. 29–34, and adds nothing to the above as to the mode of his baptism.

The impression which strikes every unprejudiced mind, on reading these passages, is, that here is an account of an immersion. Every one will see the absurdity of going into the river for sprinkling or pouring. After his baptism, he "went up straightway out of the water." Why all this, if a few drops of water only were necessary? He was baptized of John *in Jordan*. This fact destroys all that evasion which has been attempted by rendering *apo from*, instead of *out of*. If *apo* only meant *from* the Jordan, still, if he was baptized *in the Jordan*, he must necessarily come out of it, whether *apo* expresses *out of* or not.

Says Dr. Fairchild, p. 60, "Now, it is plain that Jesus 'went up out of the water' by his own act, not by that of John. Consequently he was not

dipped by John. To suit the Baptist theory, the Evangelist should have said, 'And Jesus when he was baptized was *drawn up* or *lifted out* of the water.'" Splendid logic! Jesus went into the river and was baptized, immersed; and when he was immersed, that is, after his immersion, he came up out of the water, — came to the shore by his own act. I never saw one immersed but he afterward came up out of the water *by his own act.*

Another evasion has been attempted by saying that *in* Jordan only meant *at* the Jordan. Nay, but it is said *before* that, that Jesus came from Galilee *to* Jordan. Matt. iii. 13. And after he had come *to (epi)* Jordan, he was baptized *in (eis)* Jordan. Mark i. 9. Inspiration makes the distinction perfectly plain. He came *to* the Jordan, and then was baptized *in* Jordan.

How strangely Pedobaptists quibble upon *apo!* Hear Dr. Fairchild, p. 58: "Luke ii. 4, 'Joseph also *went up from* Galilee.' Did he emerge from under the soil of Galilee?" Who said anything about the *soil?* He surely came *out of Galilee.* Dr. Fairchild thinks *Galilee* means the *soil.* Again, "Song, iii. 6, 'Who is she *coming up from* the wilderness?' Did the spouse emerge or ascend from under the sands of the desert?" Here he seems to think that *wilderness* means simply the *sands of the desert.* She surely came *out of* the wilderness.

"John xi. 55, 'And many *went out of* the country *up* to Jerusalem.' Did they emerge out of the

earth, like the fabled offspring of the serpent's teeth?" Here again he makes *country* mean *earth*. What wonderful discrimination! Yet these learned men give us the best arguments they have; and this is a sample of their discrimination and logic when reasoning on baptism!

Dr. Hibbard says, "Jesus was baptized *into the Jordan*." Vol. ii. p. 132.

Pedobaptists have attempted to prove that Jesus was not baptized as an example for us to follow. Why should they be so much afraid of our following the example of Christ in baptism, if his baptism was not immersion, but sprinkling, as they contend? Whether Jesus was baptized in order to present us an example, or not, his baptism *was an example of baptism*. He was baptized. We are to be baptized. The *act* which he performed is the same that *we* are to perform. His own *baptism* shows what he meant by the command *baptize*. He himself performed the act which he requires us to perform. We learn what that act *was*, by witnessing what he *did*. This is all that Baptists mean when they speak of following the *example* of Christ in baptism; that they do the same act which he did. When they follow his example in this respect, they are certain that they are baptized. His own baptism is, therefore, an example of *baptism*, the act required of us. It is his own practical exposition of the meaning of the word *baptize*.

Our Saviour, then, meant by the word *baptize*

something which required him to go into the river Jordan. That something could not have been sprinkling or pouring, for they would not require him to go into the river. Nothing but immersion made it necessary for him to go into the water. Immersion is, then, what *he meant* by the word *baptism.* It is what he meant when he commanded his disciples to *baptize.* It is the duty he commands believers now to perform. Sprinkling and pouring do not obey the command. But you shall see how Pedobaptists attempt to evade this argument.

Drs. Cooke and Towne. "It requires one guess to reach the conclusion that Christ is our example in baptism. John's baptism was a *Jewish* rite, under the *old* dispensation. What have we to do with it? Before we can feel bound ourselves to follow Christ in the observance of a *Jewish* ceremony, or at liberty to impose any such duty upon others, we must have at least some proof that he *designed* this act for our imitation" *Hints to an Inquirer*, p. 39.

Was not the act which he performed *baptism?* And is not that *the act* enjoined on believers *now?* Even if we admit, as we do not, that John's baptism was a *Jewish* rite, and under the *old* dispensation, still it would be true that the commission given by Christ to his apostles enjoins the *same act,* namely, *baptism,* and perpetuates the same duty, *to be baptized.*

Dr. Hibbard. "Where is it written in Scripture

that our Saviour was baptized for the purpose of setting his followers an example? There is no such declaration in the Bible. Nor is the doctrine deducible, by any correct rules of criticism, from the sacred text. Where, then, is the proof required? Candid reader, there is NO proof." Vol. ii. p. 36.

Just as if all this *prevented* our Saviour's baptism *from being an example* of baptism! The eunuch was baptized by Philip. I suppose the object of his being baptized was not that he might furnish an example of baptism for the purpose of being imitated by others. He was baptized because it was a duty which God commanded. Yet, was not the eunuch's baptism *an example* of baptism? Why is all this quibbling about the example of Christ, if he was not immersed? If he was immersed, we ought to be, for that is what he meant by the word *baptize*, demonstrated by his own *example*. Jesus does say, "Thus it becometh *us* to fulfil all righteousness." This implies that others beside himself had this duty to perform. "Thus it becometh *us*." Jesus was not in the habit of using the plural number when speaking only of himself. We have the same duty to perform, namely, to be baptized, if we are true believers. "Thus it becometh *us* to fulfil all righteousness." "Ye are my friends if ye do *whatsoever* I command you."

Still another effort has been made, by the advocates of sprinkling, to avoid the conclusion that Jesus was immersed. They insist that his baptism

was his *consecration as a Jewish priest*, and that his baptism consisted of some of the ceremonial sprinklings.

COOKE and TOWNE, p. 39. "Christ's baptism was his introduction into the priest's office."

HIBBARD, vol. ii. p. 41. "We find no law that required Christ to be baptized, at this particular juncture, but the law enjoining and regulating priestly consecration, recorded in Exod. xxix. and Lev. viii."

Was John engaged in consecrating Jewish priests in the Jordan? John had nothing to do with the consecration of priests. His baptism was not at all in accordance with the law for the consecration of Jewish priests. The law referred to by Dr. Hibbard, Exod. xxix. 4, says, "Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the *door of the Tabernacle* of the congregation, and shalt wash them with water." This was accompanied by the sacrifice of a bullock, burnt offerings, the sacrifice of two rams, the offering of unleavened bread, cakes, oil and flour, and various other ceremonies, not one of which John performed.

Jesus was not *washed with water at the door of the Tabernacle* when he was baptized of John in Jordan. If Jesus intended his baptism to be a consecration to the priest's office according to the law in Exod. xxix., he *entirely failed to comply with its requirements.* If you give his baptism this interpretation, you make him VIOLATE instead of *fulfil*

the law. Did John, who was full of the Holy Ghost, and Christ the Son of God, *break* the very law they intended to *fulfil*, by the baptism in the river Jordan, instead of the washing at the door of the Tabernacle, *which the law directed?* Let poor mortals beware how they lay such a charge of disobedience against the Son of God, by saying that his baptism was to fulfil the Mosaic law of induction into the priesthood.

In Leviticus viii. is the historical record of Moses' compliance with the *law* recorded in Exod. xxix.; and it is a very different thing from John's baptizing in the river Jordan. "And Moses did as the Lord commanded him, and the assembly was gathered together unto the door of the Tabernacle of the congregation. And Moses said unto the congregation, This is the thing which the Lord commanded to be done. And Moses brought Aaron and his sons, and washed them with water. And he put upon him the coat and girded him with the girdle, and clothed him with the robe, and put the ephod upon him, and he girded him with the curious girdle of the ephod, and bound it unto him therewith. And he put the breastplate upon him." How utterly different is this from the baptism of Jesus in Jordan! The baptism of Jesus could not have been intended as a fulfilment of that law.

Some have quoted Num. viii. 6, 7, as the law fulfilled by Christ at his baptism. "Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them.

And thus shalt thou do to cleanse them: sprinkle water of purification upon them." But this is the law for the *Levites*. If Jesus fulfilled this law, in his baptism it would show that he was not a priest, but only a *Levite*.

But the Scriptures entirely forbid the idea that Jesus was consecrated as a priest under the ceremonial law. Heb. vii. 14, "It is evident that our Lord sprang out of *Judah*, of which tribe *Moses spake nothing concerning the priesthood*." If Moses spake nothing concerning the priesthood in the tribe of Judah, it is positively certain that he did not prescribe the ceremonies of their consecration. Yet Pedobaptists insist that he did, and that Jesus was baptized to fulfil the Mosaic ceremony.

The Jewish priests were of the tribe of Levi, not of Judah, and all the laws of Moses concerning the priesthood had reference to the tribe of Levi, and to them alone.

Heb. vii. 11. "If, therefore, perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, what further need was there that *another* Priest should rise after the order of Melchizedek, and not be called after the order of Aaron. 12. For the priesthood being CHANGED, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Christ is indeed our great High Priest, but he is a priest after the order of Melchizedek, and not after Aaron and Levi. As there is a *change* of the priesthood, so also of the law; hence Christ was not inducted into the priesthood according to any law laid

down by Moses for the Aaronic or Levitical priesthood.

Let men say what they will against the immersion of our Saviour, still the public mind will cherish the idea that he was immersed. This is undoubtedly the belief of the common mind throughout the world as men read the Scripture account of it. This is confirmed by the observation of LIEUTENANT LYNCH, in his Expedition to the Jordan, and while at the place where our Saviour was baptized. Speaking of the pilgrims whom he saw coming to visit the place where Jesus was baptized, he says, "Copts and Russians, Poles, Armenians, Greeks and Syrians, from all parts of Asia, from Europe, from Africa, and from far-distant America, on they came; men, women, and children, of every age and hue, talking, screaming, shouting, in almost every known language under the sun. They seemed to be absorbed by one impulsive feeling, and perfectly regardless of the observation of others. Each one plunged himself, or was dipped by another, three times below the surface, in honor of the Trinity." *Expedition*, pp. 262, 263.

REV. MR. SPENCER, of the Episcopal Church in New York, thus speaks of his visit to the Jordan. After having waded into the river, he says, "I seemed to be looking on the solemn and touching scene of our Lord's baptism by his messenger whom he sent to prepare the way before him. Earnestly did I supplicate that God of his

mercy would wash and purify my soul, body, and spirit by the blood of Jesus Christ our Lord: and with the deepest reverence, remembering whom I was worshiping, I bowed my head beneath the waters of the Jordan three times, and pronounced each time the name of the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY GHOST, the TRIUNE GOD of our salvation." *The East*, by Rev. J. A. Spencer, p. 392. In *Chase on Bap.* p. 143.

Pedobaptists have said that Jesus acknowledged that he derived his priestly authority from the baptism of John.

Says Dr. Hibbard, vol. i. 41, "Christ did exercise the office of a priest when he purged the temple; and when the chief priests and rulers demanded of him, on that occasion, by what authority he did these things, Christ appealed to the baptism of John. Matt. xxi. 12, 23–27. This is worthy of particular notice, as he evidently appealed to John's baptism for a vindication of the authority he had exercised." The same argument is used by Dr. Peters, p. 57.

But unfortunately for this argument, our Saviour says expressly in verse 27, "*Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things.*" Drs. Hibbard and Peters say that Jesus *does* tell by what authority he did those things. Jesus says he *does not.* Which is right? Yet these men flatly contradict the Saviour, in order to avoid the evidence which our Saviour's baptism affords of immersion! All the circumstances attending that solemn event,

which are recorded in the Scripture, clearly indicate that Jesus went into the river Jordan and was immersed by John the Baptist. This act of our Saviour shows unmistakably what he meant by the word *baptize*. It shows, too, what is our duty in obeying this command.

WITSIUS. "Our Lord would be baptized, that he might conciliate authority to the baptism of John, —that by his own example he might commend and sanctify our baptism,—that men might not be loth to come to the baptism of the Lord, seeing the Lord was not backward to come to the baptism of a servant,—that by his baptism he might represent the future condition of both himself and his followers; first humble, then glorious; now mean and low, then glorious and exalted; *that* represented by *immersion, this* by *emersion*." *Pengilly*, p. 17.

MACKNIGHT. "Jesus submitted to be baptized,— that is, to be buried under the water by John, and to be raised out of it again,—as an emblem of his future death and resurrection." On Rom. vi. 4.

DODDRIDGE. "After Jesus was baptized, as soon as he ascended out of the water, behold, the heavens were opened unto him." *In loco.*

GEORGE CAMPBEEL. "Jesus being baptized, no sooner rose out of the water, than heaven was opened unto him." On Matt. iii. 46.

MR. POLHILL. "The pattern of Christ and the apostles is more to me than all the human wisdom in the world." *Pengilly*, p. 18.

CHAPTER XVI.

ROM. VI. 4—"BURIED IN BAPTISM."

Design of the passage—To enforce the duty of a holy life by reference to baptism as a burial and resurrection—Admission of Prof. Stuart—Baptism not a moral but physical burial, emblematical of the moral—Not a baptism of the Spirit, but of water—Unanimity of commentators—Eighty-two commentators on this passage, all saying that it refers to baptism by immersion as the primitive practice—The apostles understood baptism to be a *burial*—Our duty.

ROM. vi. 3–5. "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection."

Colossians ii. 12. "Buried with him in baptism, wherein ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."

The evident design of the apostle in these passages is to enforce the duty of a holy life and conversation. "Shall we continue in sin, that grace may

abound? God forbid. How shall we that are *dead to sin* live any longer therein." Our very baptism teaches us to live no longer in sin. We have died to sin, and because we have died to sin, therefore we are *buried with Christ* by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead, even so *we also should walk in newness of life.* When one has died, he is afterwards *buried.* Our conversion was our death to sin. Our baptism was our burial, to testify in the most solemn and impressive manner that we had renounced the world and sin, and henceforth we were to live a *new* life of holiness. Our *immersion* is a solemn burial, showing to the world that we have died to sin. Our *emersion* is a resurrection, showing by a beautiful and impressive emblem that we are to walk in newness of life.

Learned commentators, with remarkable unanimity, have given the passage the above interpretation for fifteen hundred years and more. It is but recently that any have attempted a different interpretation, and these have done so, seemingly, merely to get rid of the testimony which this passage gives in favor of immersion.

PROF. STUART admits that "Most commentators have maintained that *buried* here has a necessary reference to the mode of literal baptism, *which, they say, was by immersion;* and this, they think, affords the ground for the employment of the image used by the apostles, because *immersion* (under the

water) may be compared to a *burial* (under the earth.") *Stuart on Bap.* p. 100.

Here are two important admissions from Prof. Stuart. 1. That *most commentators* say the passage refers to the mode of baptism. 2. That they say *baptism* in the apostles' days was *immersion.*

Although Prof. Stuart thinks possibly it was only a *moral* and not *physical* burial in baptism, to which the apostle alludes, yet it is a law of all figurative language that the figure employed points to a certain *likeness* or *resemblance.* The likeness in this passage is that of *baptism* to a *burial.* That likeness is found only in immersion.

If the apostle only intended to refer to the *moral* change, and not to literal baptism, why did he not say, "We are buried with him by *faith*, or *repentance*, or *regeneration?*" These express a moral change alone. But when he says we are *buried* by *baptism*, he evidently discovers a resemblance between *baptism* and a *burial.* He had *previously* referred to the *moral* change, when he said, "How shall we that are *dead* to sin live any longer therein?" He now, in verse 4, gives additional strength to his argument, by saying we are not only *dead* to sin, but our very *baptism* was a *burial in water* into death, a striking emblem and testimony that we had died to sin.

In our baptism there is a literal burial and a literal resurrection; and these literal things are signs and emblems of the spiritual things. The

figure is full and clear. So the great mass of learned commentators of all ages, sects and countries, have understood it. The very effort which has *recently* been made to take from this passage its testimony in favor of immersion, shows how much the opponents of immersion feel the force of this testimony.

Some of late have attempted to show that it means the baptism of the Spirit, and not water baptism. They fancy that *conversion* is a baptism of the Spirit, and this is what is meant by the apostle here. But this evidently cannot be, for such an interpretation would make the apostle say virtually: We have been baptized with the Holy Ghost, (died to sin,) therefore we are buried with him by baptism of the Holy Ghost. That is, the reason *why* we are baptized by the Holy Ghost is, because we have been baptized with the Holy Ghost. Such distorted interpretations to help the cause of sprinkling, are revolting to common sense, and offensive to common candor.

To show with what unanimity the best commentators have interpreted this passage as referring to the apostolic mode of baptism, and their unanimity in testifying that the apostolic mode of baptism was immersion, I will here quote a large number of them.

COMMENTATORS ON ROM. VI. 4, AND COL. II. 12.

1. MACKNIGHT, the Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly of Scotland in 1769.

"In baptism, the baptized person is buried under water, as one put to death with Christ on account of sin, in order that they may be strongly impressed with a sense of the malignity of sin, and excited to hate it as the greatest of evils." *On Epist.* vol. i. p. 259.

"Christ submitted to be baptized; that is, to be buried under the water by John, and to be raised out of it again, as an emblem of his future death and resurrection. In like manner the baptism of believers is emblematical of their own death, burial and resurrection." *On Rom.* vi. 4.

2. JOHN WESLEY, the founder of Methodism. "Buried with him—alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." *Notes on Rom.* vi. 4.

3. GEORGE WHITEFIELD, the great Evangelist. "It is certain that in the words of our text, Rom. vi. 4, there is an allusion to the manner of baptizing, which was by immersion." *Pengilly*, p. 47.

4. DR. WALL, Episcopalian, author of History of Infant Baptism. "St. Paul does twice, in an allusive way of speaking, call baptism a burial." *Defence of Hist. of Inf. Bap.* p. 131.

5. ARCHBISHOP TILLOTSON, Episcopalian. "Anciently, those who were baptized were immersed and buried in the water to represent their death to sin, and then did rise up out of the water to signify their entrance upon a new life; and to these customs the apostle alludes in Rom. vi. 4." *Pengilly*, p. 46.

6. ARCHBISHOP SEEKER, Episcopalian. "Burying, as it were, the person in the water, and raising him out again, *without question* was anciently the more usual method: on account of which St. Paul speaks of baptism as representing both the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and what is grounded on them — our being dead and buried to sin, and our rising again to walk in newness of life." *Pengilly*, p. 46.

7. SAMUEL CLARKE. "We are buried with Christ by baptism, &c. In the primitive times the manner of baptizing was by immersion, or dipping the whole body into the water. And this manner of doing it was a very significant emblem of the dying and rising again, referred to by St. Paul in the above-mentioned similitude." *Ibid.*

8. BURKITT'S *Notes on the New Test.* On Rom. vi. 4, "The apostle alludes no doubt to the ancient manner and way of baptizing persons in those hot countries, which was by immersion, or putting them under the water for a time, and raising them up again out of the water, which rite had also a mystical signification, representing the burial of our old man, sin in us, and our resurrection to newness of life."

9. OLSHAUSEN'S *Commentary on Rom.* vi. 4. "In this passage we are by no means to refer the baptism merely to their own resolutions, or see in it merely a figure in which the one half of the ancient baptismal rite,—the *submersion merely* prefigures

the death and burial of the old man,—the second half the *emersion*, the resurrection of the new man."

10. Conybeare and Howson's Life and Epist. of St. Paul, vol. i. p. 439. "Baptism was immersion, the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water, to represent his death to sin, and then raised from this momentary burial to represent his resurrection to a life of righteousness." Also on Rom. vi. 4. "This passage *cannot be understood* unless it is borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion."

11. Dr. Hammond, Ch. of Eng. on Rom. vi. 4. "It is a thing that *every Christian knows*, that the immersion in baptism refers to the death of Christ; the putting of the person into the water denotes and proclaims the death and burial of Christ." *Hague's last Reply to Cooke and Towne*, p. 107.

12. Bishop Hoadly. "If baptism had been then performed as it is now among us, we should never so much as heard of this form of expression, of dying and rising again in this rite." *Ib.*

13. Drs. Storr and Flatt's Biblical Theol., Andover, 1826. "The disciples of our Lord could understand his command in *no other manner* than as enjoining immersion; and that they actually did understand it so, is proved partly by those passages of Scripture which evidently allude to immersion, Acts viii. 36; Rom. vi. 4." *Ut supra*, p. 24.

14. Martin Luther. "Baptism is a sign of both

death and resurrection. Being moved by this reason, I would have those that are to be baptized to be altogether dipped into the water, as the word doth express and the mystery doth signify" *Ut supra*, pp. 109, 110.

15. Dr. R. Newton, on Rom. vi. 4. "Baptism was usually performed by immersion, or dipping the whole body under water, to represent the death, burial and resurrection of Christ together." *Slack's Reasons for becoming a Bap.* p. 56.

16. Richard Baxter, author of "Saint's Rest," &c. "It is commonly confessed by us of the Anabaptists, as our commentators declare, that in the apostles' times the baptized were dipped over head in the water, and that this signified their profession both of the believing the burial and resurrection of Christ, and of their own present renouncing of the world and flesh, or of dying to sin, and living to Christ, or rising again to newness of life, or being buried and risen again with Christ, as the apostle expoundeth in the fore cited texts." *Westlake*, ch. 5.

17. Bishop Smith, Bishop Protestant Episcopal Church of Kentucky. "Buried in baptism—all continue to render the fact as early ascertained, far more reconcileable with Scripture than any contrary theory can possibly be. If any one practice of the early churches is clearly ascertained, it is immersion." *Bliss' Letters*, p. 24.

18. Westminster Assembly of Divines, consisting of fifty eminent ministers, in Annotations on

Rom. vi. 4. "'Buried with him in baptism.' In this phrase, the apostle seemeth to allude to the ancient manner of baptism, which was to dip the parties baptized, and, as it were, bury them under water." *Judson*, p. 24.

19. Wm. Tyndale. "The plunging into the water signifieth that we die and are buried with Christ, as concerning the old life of sin, which is in Adam. And the pulling out again signifieth that we rise again with Christ in a new life." *Westlake*, p. 5.

20. Dr. Chalmers, Presbyterian, of Scotland, on Rom. vi. 4. "In the act of descending under the water of baptism, to have resigned an old life, and in the act of ascending to emerge into a second or new life—along the course of which it is our part to maintain a strenuous avoidance of sin."

The early Christian writers interpret this passage in the same way.

21. Chrysostom, born A. D. 347. "To be baptized and to submerge, then to *emerge*, is a symbol of descent to the grave, and of ascent from it. And therefore Paul calls baptism a burial when he says, We are therefore buried with him by baptism into death." *Westlake*, ch. 3; *Stuart*, p. 147.

22. Ambrose, born A. D. 340. "You were asked, 'Dost thou believe in God Almighty?' Thou saidst, 'I believe;' and thus thou wast immerged, (mersisti,) that is, thou wast buried." *Stuart*, p. 147.

23. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, A. D. 350. "Thou, going down into the water, and in a man-

ner buried in the waters, as he in the rock, art raised again, walking in newness of life." *Conant*, Ex. 176. "Ye professed the saving profession and sunk down thrice into the water, and again came up, and thereby a symbol shadowing forth the burial of Christ." *Conant*, Ex. 178.

24. GREGORY NYSSEN, born A. D. 328. "Coming into water, the kindred element of earth, we *hide ourselves in it*, as the Saviour did in the earth." *Stuart*, p. 147. "Let us therefore be buried with Christ in baptism, that we may also rise with him; let us go down with him, that we also may be exalted with him." *Conant*, Ex. 189.

25. APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS, written in the fourth century. "Immersion denotes dying with him, [Christ;] emersion a resurrection with Christ." *Stuart*, p. 148.

26. JOHN DAMASCENUS, born at the end of seventh century. "Baptism represents the death of our Lord. It is a type of his death,—the first baptism was the flood—the old man is entirely buried in water." *Adkins*, p. 128.

27. ATHANASIUS, Bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 328. "To *immerse* a child three times in a bath or pool, and to *emerse* him; this shows the death and resurrection, on the third day, of Christ." *Stuart*, p. 148; *Conant*, Ex. 188.

28. BASIL the Great, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, A. D. 370. "By three immersions we rep-

resent the death of Christ,—the bodies of those that are baptized are buried in water." *Conant*, Ex. 181.

29. JUSTIN MARTYR, A. D. 140. "We represent our Lord's sufferings by baptism in a pool." *Adkins*, p. 127.

30. THEODORET, Bishop of Cyrrhus, A. D. 423, on Rom. vi. 4. "Baptism is a type of our Lord's death." *Adkins*, p. 128.

31. DIONYSIUS AREOPAGUS. "Properly, the total covering by water is taken from an image of death and burial out of sight." *Adkins*, 128.

32. CLEMENT, of Alexandria, A. D. 200. "You were led to a bath as Christ was conveyed to the sepulchre, and were thrice immersed, to signify Christ's three days' burial." *Adkins*, p. 127.

33. FOURTH COUNCIL OF TOLEDO, Can. 5. "The immersion in water is, as it were, the descent into the grave, and the emersion from the water the resurrection." *Adkins*, p. 128.

34. PHOTIUS. "The three immersions and emersions of baptism signify death and the resurrection." *Stuart*, p. 148.

35. GELASIUS; 36. GREGORY; 37. PELAGIUS, give the same exposition as Photius. *Adkins*, p. 129.

38. ARCHBISHOP CRANMER. "The dipping into water doth betoken that the old Adam, with all his sin and evil lusts, ought to be drowned and killed by daily contrition and repentance." *Westlake*, ch. 3.

39. SCUDDER. "Baptism doth lively represent the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, together

with your crucifying the affections and lusts; being dead and buried with him unto sin, and rising with him to newness of life, and to hope of glory." *Westlake*, ch. 3.

40. PICTETUS. "That immersion into and emersion out of the water, as practiced by the ancients, signify the death of the old and the resurrection of the new." *Ut supra.*

41. NICHOLSON, Bishop of Gloucester, Expos. of Ch. Catechism. "The ancient manner of baptizing and putting the person baptized under the water, and then taking him out again, did well set forth these two acts: the first, his dying, the second, his rising again. In our baptism, by a kind of analogy or resemblance, while our bodies are under the water, we may be said to be buried with him." *Ut supra.*

42. DR. MANTON, Chaplain to the King of England. "The putting the baptized person into the water denoteth and proclaimeth the burial of Christ, and we, by submitting to it, are buried with him, or profess to be dead to sin; for none but the dead are buried. So that it signifieth Christ's death for sin, and our death unto sin." *Ut supra.*

43. AUGUSTINE. "That thrice repeated submersion expresses a resemblance of the Lord's burial." *Stuart*, p. 149.

44. BENGELLIUS, Professor of Theology at Denkendorf, Germany, in 1713. "He that is baptized puts on Christ the second Adam; he is baptized, I

say, into a whole Christ, and therefore into his death; and it is like as if, that very moment, Christ suffered, died, and was buried for such a man, and such a man suffered, died, and was buried with Christ." *Westlake*, ch. 3.

45. Dr. T. Goodwin, member of the Westminster Assembly. "There is a further representation therein of Christ's death, burial and resurrection, in the baptized's being first buried under water and then rising out of it. Therefore it is said, We are buried with him in baptism." *Ut supra.*

46. Doddridge's Family Expositor, on Rom. vi. 4. "*Buried with him in baptism.* It seems to me the part of candor to confess that here is an allusion to the manner of baptizing by immersion."

47. Wells' Illust. Bib. on Rom. vi. 4. "St. Paul here alludes to immersion or dipping the whole body under water in baptism." *Pengilly*, 46.

48. Whitby's Commentary on New Test. Note on Rom. vi. 4. "It being so expressly declared here, Rom. vi. 4, and Col. ii. 12, that we are buried with Christ in baptism, by being buried under water; and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death being taken hence, and this *immersion being religiously observed by all Christians for thirteen centuries*, and approved by our Church, and the change of it into sprinkling, even without any allowance from the Author of this institution, or any license from any council of the Church, being that which the Romanist still urges to justify his

refusal of the cup to the laity; it were to be wished that this custom might be of general use, and aspersion only permitted, as of old, in cases of the clinici, or present danger of death." *Pengilly*, p. 47.

49. ADAM CLARKE, the Methodist commentator, on Rom. vi. 4. "When he [the person baptized] came up out of the water, he seemed to have a resurrection to life. He was therefore supposed to throw off his old Gentile state, as he threw off his clothes, and to assume a new character, as the baptized generally put on new or fresh garments."

50. JOHN EDWARDS. "The immersion into the water was thought to signify the death of Christ, and their coming out, his rising again, and did no less represent their own resurrection." *Pengilly*, p. 49.

51. EDINBURGH REVIEWERS. "We have rarely met, for example, a more weak and fanciful piece of reasoning than that by which Mr. Ewing would persuade us that there is no allusion to the mode, by immersion, in the expression, 'buried with him in baptism.' This point ought to be frankly admitted, and indeed cannot be denied with any show of reason." *Ib.* p. 47.

52. BLOOMFIELD'S Greek Testament, note on Rom. vi. 4. "By which the rite of immersion in the baptismal water and egress from it were used as a symbol of breaking off all connection with the present sinful life, and giving one's self to a new and pure one. We have been thus buried in the waters of

baptism. There is a plain allusion to the ancient custom of baptism by immersion, on which (says Bloomfield) see

53. Suicer's Eccl. in V. cited in

54. Bingham's Antiquities of the Chr. Ch. "Immersion universally prevailed, since all the ancients thought that burying under water did more lively represent the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ."

Bloomfield also cites to the same effect,

55. Bishop Sherlock, cited in Recens. Syn. and

56. Bishop Warburton, Div. Leg. vol. ii. p. 153.

57. Saurin's Sermons, vol. iii. p. 176. "Paul says we are buried with Christ by baptism into death; that is, the ceremony of wholly immersing us in water when we were baptized, signified that we died to sin; and that of rising again from our immersion signified that we would no more return to those disorderly practices in which we lived before our conversion to Christianity." *Benedict's Hist.* p. 179.

58. Archbishop Leighton. "'We are buried with him.' The dipping into the waters representing our dying with Christ, and the return thence, our rising with him." *Works*, p. 277.

59. Matthies' Bibilical, Historical, and Dogmatical Exposition of Baptism, which obtained a prize in the University of Berlin, says, "Paul, as we have seen, Rom. vi. 4, has in his mind only the rite of immersing and emerging; and in the Apostolic Church, in order that a communion with the death

of Christ might be signified, the whole body of the person to be baptized was immersed in the water, or river, and then, in order that a connection with the resurrection of Christ might be indicated, the body again emerged or was raised out of the water. That this rite has been changed is indeed a calamity, for it placed before the eyes most aptly the symbolical meaning of baptism." *Dr. I. Chase on Bap.* pp. 50, 51.

60. ROSENMULLER, Professor of Theology at Leipsic, says, "Immersion in the water of baptism and coming forth out of it, was a symbol of a person's renouncing his former life, and, on the contrary, of beginning a new one. The learned have rightly reminded us that, on account of this emblematical meaning of baptism, the rite of *immersion* ought to have been retained in the Christian Church." *I. Chase on Bap.* p. 49.

61. JASPIS, in his Latin version of the Epistles, says, "Paul, in this place, Rom. vi. 4, alludes to the custom then usual, of immersing the whole body, which immersion resembled the laying of a man in a sepulchre." *Ut supra*, p. 49.

62. A. H. FRANKIUS. "The baptism of Christ represented his sufferings, Matt. xx. 22, and his coming up out of the water his resurrection from the dead." *Frey on Bap.* p. 125.

63. TURRETIN. "For as in baptism, when performed in the *primitive manner*, by immersion and emersion, descending into the water and again going

out of it, of which descent and ascent we have an example in the eunuch, Acts viii. 38, 39, yea, and what is more, as by this rite, when persons are immersed in water, they are overwhelmed, and, as it were, *buried*, and in a manner *buried* together with Christ, and again they emerge, seem to be raised out of the grave, and are said to be risen again with Christ." *Ib.* p. 126.

64. THEOPHYLACT, a Greek commentator, on Col. iii. 1. "Baptism typifies by *immersion* the death, by *emersion* the resurrection of Christ." *Adkins*, p. 128.

65. LEO, bishop of Rome, Decret. 9. "Trine immersion represents the three days' burial of Christ." *Ut supra.*

66. THOLUCK, on Rom. vi. 4. "In order to understand the figurative use of baptism, we must bear in mind *the well known fact* that the candidate in the primitive Church was immersed in water and raised out of it again." *Ut supra*, p. 130.

67. WINER, in his Manuscript Letters on Christian Antiquities, says, "In the apostolic age baptism was immersion, as its symbolical explanation shows." *Ut supra.*

68. PROF. LANGE, on Infant Baptism, 1834. "As Christ died, so we die (to sin) with him in baptism. The body is, as it were, *buried* under water, is dead with Christ; the plunging under water represents death, and rising out of it the resurrection to a new life. A more striking symbol could not be chosen." *Ut supra.*

69. Dr. Jortin's Sermons. Of the baptized he says, "He that descended into the water and stooped or laid down in it. This represents death and the grave,—his ascending out of the water, under which he had been hidden,—represented the resurrection of Christ for our justification, and the new life and second birth of the baptized person who was thenceforward to live to God and to do good works." *Frey on Bap.* pp. 128, 129.

70. Superville, Pastor of the French Protestant Church at Rotterdam, says, "You know that in ancient times baptism was administered by immersion, so that the person who was baptized, being entirely plunged into the water, appeared for a moment as one dead and buried; after which emerging from the water, he seemed as one rising from the dead. Hence the language of the apostle in Rom. vi. 4, Col. ii. 12," *ut supra.*

71. Burmannus. Synob. Theol. Tom. ii. Loc. 43, ch. vi. § 9. "Immersion was used by the Jews, the apostles, and the primitive Church, especially in warm countries. To this, various forms of speaking used by the apostles refer, Rom. vi. 4, Col. ii. 12, &c." *Frey*, p. 132.

72. Peter Martyr. "As Christ, by baptism, hath drawn us into his death and burial, so he hath drawn us out into life. This doth the dipping into the waters and the issuing forth again, signify when we are baptized." *Westlake*, ch. iii.

73. Albert Barnes. "It is altogether probable

that the apostle in this place had allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion." *Note on Rom.* vi. 4.

74. ESTIUS. "Immersion in a more expressive manner, represents the death, burial, and resurrection of our Lord and of us." *Frey*, p. 150.

75. BRAUNUS, in his Doctrina Federum. "By baptism we are plunged under water, and, as it were, buried; but we do not continue in a state of death, for we immediately rise again from thence, to signify that we, through the merits of Christ, and with Christ, mortify the old man, are buried with Christ, and with him arise to newness of life." *Haynes' Bap. Cyclopedia*, p. 78.

76. DR. BOYS' Works. "The dipping in holy baptism has three parts, the putting into the water, the continuance in the water, and the coming out of the water. The putting into the water doth ratify the mortification of sin by the power of Christ's death, as Paul in Rom. vi. 4." *Ut supra*, p. 99.

77. RHEINHARD'S Ethics. "In sprinkling, the symbolical meaning of the ordinance is wholly lost." *Hinton's Hist. Bap.* p. 56.

78. BISHOP BURNETT'S *Expos. of the Thirty-nine Articles*, pp. 374, 375. "They (the primitive ministers of the Gospel) led them into the water, and with no other garments but what might cover nature, they first *laid them down in the water*, as a man is buried in a grave, and then they said the words, '*I baptize thee in the name of the Father*,

Son, and Holy Ghost.' Then they raised them up again, and clean garments were put on them, from whence came the phrases of being baptized into Christ's death, of our being *buried with him by baptism into death*, being *baptized into Christ's death*, of our *being risen with Christ*, and of our *putting on Christ, putting off the old man, and putting on the new man.*"

79. CARDINAL CAJETAN. (1500.) "'*We are buried with him by baptism into death.*' By our burying he declares our death, from the ceremony of baptism: because he who is baptized is put under the water, and by this bears a likeness of him that was buried, who is put under the earth. Now because none are buried but dead men, from this very thing we are buried in baptism, we are assimilated to Christ when he was buried. Christ ascended out of the water; therefore he was baptized by John, not by sprinkling or pouring water upon him, but by immersion." *Booth's Ped. Ex.*

80. DR. CAVE'S Primitive Christianity. "As in immersion there are in a manner three several acts, the putting a person into the water, his abiding there for a little time, and his rising again; so by these were represented Christ's death, burial, and resurrection; and in conformity thereunto, our dying unto sin, the destruction of its power, and our resurrection to a new course of life. By the person's being put into water was lively represented the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, and

being washed from the filth and pollution of them," &c. *Booth's Ped. Ex.*

81. Bishop Davenant, of Salisbury, Eng 1641, Expos. of Col. ii. 12. "In baptism, the burial of the body of sin, or of the old Adam, is represented when the person to be baptized is put down into the water, as a resurrection when he is brought out of it." *Haynes' Bap. Cyclopedia,* p. 186.

82. John Fell, Bishop of Oxford, 1625–1686. In his Paraphrase and Annotations on St. Paul's Epistles, Rom. vi. 4. "The primitive fashion of immersion under the water, representing our death, and elevation out of it, our resurrection, our regeneration." *Ut supra,* pp. 246, 247.

83. Dr. Quenstedt, (Lutheran.) "*Immersion* is similar to a burial; *emersion* to a resurrection." *Wiberg,* p. 83.

84. Ch. Starke. "The Apostle has reference to the then prevailing custom, according to which the candidate was entirely immersed in water; and after he had been left under a little while, was again taken up out of it. Baptism consequently does not only contain the image and power of the death of Christ, but of his burial; so that, as the Lord by his burial has done away with the curse that lay upon him, we also might be partakers of his burial, when we were laid down under the water as in a grave, and covered with it." *Wiberg,* p. 113.

85. Locke. "We did own some kind of a death by being buried under the water—even so we being

raised from our typical death and burial in baptism, should lead a new sort of life." *Campbell and Rice*, p. 235.

86. DR. G. C. KNAPP. "The image is here taken from baptized persons as they were *immerged* (buried,) and as they *emerged* (rose again;) so it was understood by Chrysostom." *Theol.* vol. ii. p. 525.

It would be difficult to find any passage of Scripture on which there has been a greater unanimity of views than upon this. The recent efforts of Pedobaptists to pervert it from its proper meaning, because it is such positive proof that immersion was the baptism of Christ and the apostles, show how closely they have been pressed with the Baptist argument. Paul says, "We are buried with him in baptism;" that is, he and all others who have been baptized. That was baptism as it was delivered to them by Jesus Christ. That is what is meant by baptism. No mortal has a right to change the ordinances of God. It is our duty then to be *buried in baptism.*

CHAPTER XVII.

BAPTISM OF THE HOLY GHOST AND OF FIRE.

John's declaration—Robinson's Greek Lexicon—Dr. G. Campbell—Overwhelming in the Spirit—Gurtlerus—Bloomfield—Tillotson—Cyril—Prof. Stuart—Theophylact—Neander—Bishop Reynolds—Ikenius—LeClerc—Casaubon—Bishop Hopkins—Objection—Spirit poured—But so abundantly as to *immerse*, baptize—Spirit also *descends, is breathed* on some, *shed, put, rests*, &c.—Baptism of fire—Various views—All imply immersion—Robinson—Gurtlerus—Prof. Stuart—Ikenius—Casting into fire—Burning up the chaff—Hewn down and cast into the fire—Immersed, plunged in fire.

John the Baptist declared, Matt. iii. 11, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance—He (Jesus) shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." The preposition *with* in this verse is *in* in the Greek. I baptize you *in* water; he shall baptize you *in* the Holy Ghost and fire, as is shown on pages 172, 173.

Dr. Robinson's Greek Lexicon of the New Testament, p. 126, "Metaphysically and in direct allusion to the sacred rite, baptize *en pneumati hagio kai puri*, to baptize in the Holy Ghost and in fire; i. e., to overwhelm, richly furnish with all spiritual gifts, or overwhelm with fire unquenchable. Matt

iii. 11, Luke iii. 16, Mark i. 8, John i. 33. Still in allusion to the rite. To baptize with calamities; i. e. to overwhelm with sufferings."

Dr. George Campbell, of Scotland, says, "'In water, in the Holy Spirit.' The word baptism, both in sacred authors and classical, signifies to dip, plunge, immerse. It is always construed suitably to this meaning." *Notes on New Test.*, Andover, vol. ii. p. 20.

The baptism of the Holy Ghost is an overwhelming of the Spirit's influence, not a mere *sprinkling* or a slight measure of the Spirit. There are but two or three instances in the New Testament where the baptism of the Spirit is mentioned. It was predicted by John the Baptist, and it was realized on the day of Pentecost, Acts i. 5, ii. 1–4, and in the case of Cornelius, Acts xi. 16.

On the day of Pentecost the disciples were together in one place. "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance."

The sound which accompanied the Spirit filled all the house where they were sitting. They were completely surrounded by and immersed in the Spirit. The air fills the room where I am now sit-

ting. I am immersed in the air. So they were completely surrounded and pervaded by the Spirit.

GURTLERUS, in his Institut. Theo., says, "*Baptismos en pneumati agio*, baptism in the Holy Spirit, is immersion into the pure waters of the Holy Spirit, for he on whom the Holy Spirit is poured out, is, as it were, immersed into him." *R. Fuller*, p. 19.

BLOOMFIELD'S Greek Test. vol. i. p. 447. "'*Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost*' must mean the influence of the Holy Spirit. '*Be baptized*' suggests the *abundance* of the thing. Ye shall be plenteously imbued with the influences of the Holy Spirit."

ARCHBISHOP TILLOTSON, on Acts ii. 2. "It [the sound from heaven] filled all the house. This is that which our Saviour calls *baptizing with the Holy Ghost*. So that they who sat in the house were, as it were, immersed in the Holy Ghost, as those who are buried with water, which is the proper notion of baptism." *Westlake*.

CYRIL, Bishop of Jerusalem, A. D. 350, the very place where the baptism of the Holy Spirit occurred, and only three centuries after the occurrence, says, "As he who is plunged in the water and baptized is encompassed by the water on every side, so they that are baptized by the Holy Spirit are also wholly covered over." *Pengilly*, p. 75.

These expositions all correspond with the scriptural expressions, *In the Spirit*. "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day," Rev. i. 10. "Immedi-

ately I was *in* the Spirit," Rev. iv. 2. "Carried away *in* the Spirit," Rev. xvii. 3, xxi. 10. "Ye are not *in* the flesh but in the Spirit," Rom. viii. 9. "Walk *in* the Spirit," "If we live *in* the Spirit," Gal. v. 16, 17.

PROF. STUART, on Bap. p. 74. "'*He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire*;' i. e. he will make a copious effusion of his Spirit upon a part of you, and another part, the finally impenitent, he will surround with flames, or plunge into the flames." "The basis of this usage is very plainly to be found in the designation by *baptizo* of the idea of *overwhelming*, i. e. of surrounding on all sides with fluid."

THEOPHYLACT, commenting on the baptism of the Holy Spirit, says, "That is, he shall inundate you abundantly with the gifts of the Spirit." *R. Fuller*, p. 70.

NEANDER. "Baptism was performed by immersion as a sign of entire baptism into the Holy Spirit —of being entirely penetrated by the same." *Ch. Hist.* vol. i. p. 310.

BISHOP REYNOLDS. "The Spirit under the gospel is compared to water; and that not a little measure, to sprinkle or bedew, but to baptize the faithful in, (Matt. iii. 11; Acts i. 5,) and that not in a font or vessel, which grows less and less, but in a spring or living water." *R. Fuller*, p. 72.

IKENIUS. "The Greek word baptismos denotes

the immersion of a thing or person into something." *Ut supra.*

Le Clerc. "He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit. As I plunge you in water, he shall plunge you, so to speak, in the Holy Spirit." *Ut supra.*

Casaubon. "To baptize is to immerse, and in this sense the apostles are truly said to be baptized; for the house in which this was done was filled with the Holy Ghost, so that the apostles seemed to be plunged into it as into a fish pool." *Ut supra.*

Bishop Hopkins. "Those that are baptized with the Spirit are, as it were, plunged into that heavenly flame whose searching energy devours all their dross, tin and base alloy." *Ut supra*, p. 73.

If *baptizo* means immerse, as I have fully shown, then baptism of the Holy Spirit means such an overwhelming influence of the Spirit, that it is said to be an immersion in the Spirit. When persons pray for the baptism of the Holy Spirit, do they want only a drop or two, a little sprinkling, or his overwhelming power? Pedobaptist writers already quoted, such as Robinson, Campbell, Stuart, Neander, Theophylact, Bloomfield, Gurtlerus and Tillotson, all testify that it means a complete overwhelming in the Spirit.

The principal objection which the advocates of sprinkling urge against this view, is, that the Spirit is said to have been *poured* out on the day of Pentecost. Hence they argue that *pouring* was the mode of baptism. That is not a logical conclusion.

Rain may be *sprinkled* or *poured* upon an object, or upon a part of the earth, until it becomes *immersed*. The immersion is a *consequence* of the sprinkling and pouring; but the man who would say, therefore, that *immersion* meant nothing more than *sprinkling* or *pouring*, would show himself destitute of common sense. The sunlight *pours* down from heaven, but he who steps out into it is *immersed*, completely surrounded by it. The air *pours* in at the window of a room, but whoever is in the room is *immersed* in the air, or surrounded by it. Although immersion is the *result* of pouring in these cases, yet who could possibly believe that to immerse simply means to pour. Yet this is just the argument which Pedobaptists so strenuously urge to show that baptism is only a pouring. They say the Spirit was poured out, therefore pouring is baptism. I have shown on pages 130–133 that *baptize* cannot mean *pour*, else we should read, "Jesus *baptized* out the changers' money." "Mary *baptized* oil on his head." This is absurd.

The Spirit is not literally *poured* out, only figuratively. He is not a liquid that can be literally poured. If the *pouring* were the *baptism*, the Spirit himself would be the one baptized, because the *Spirit* is poured out, not the candidates. If pouring is baptism, then the water is baptized, and not the candidates, for the former is *poured*, but the latter is not.

If pouring be a mode of baptism because the

Spirit is said to be poured out, then we shall ave many more modes of baptism besides pouring, for the same reason.

"The Holy Ghost *fell* on all." Acts x. 44. Is *falling* a mode of baptism? If so, when anything falls it is baptized. Could anything be more absurd?

"The Spirit *descended* like a dove." Matt. iii. 16. Is *descending* a mode of baptism? Is *descending like a dove* baptism? Many objects *descend* in various ways: a man descends a hill; a train of cars descends an inclined plane; a boat descends a river; a king descends his throne. Are these *descendings* baptism? Is *descending* a mode of baptism?

"He *breathed* on them, and said, *Receive* ye the Holy Ghost." John xx. 22. Is *breathing* a mode of baptism? and is *receiving* a mode of baptism?

"The Holy Ghost which was *shed* on us." Tit. iii. 6. Is *shedding* a mode of baptism? When a man *sheds* blood does he *baptize* blood? When he *sheds* tears does he *baptize* tears? When he *sheds* his hair or teeth does he *baptize* his hair or teeth? Shedding is not a mode of baptism.

"John was *filled* with the Holy Ghost." Luke i. 15. Is *filling* a mode of baptism?

"God *anointed* Jesus with the Holy Ghost." Acts x. 38. Is *anointing* a mode of baptism? When kings are anointed are they *baptized?* Mary anointed Jesus. Did she *baptize* him?

"The Holy Ghost *came* on them." Acts xix. 6 Is *coming* a mode of *baptism?*

"*Put* his Spirit within him." Isa. lxiii. 11. Is *putting* a mode of *baptism?*

"Spirit of God *resteth* on you." 1 Pet. iv. 14. Is *resting* a mode of baptism?

But if *pouring* is a mode of *baptism* because the Spirit is said to be *poured* out, then, for the same reason, would *falling, descending, breathing, receiving, shedding, filling, giving, anointing, coming, putting* and *resting,* all be modes of baptism. To such absurdity are the advocates of sprinkling driven by their method of argumentation.

We cannot doubt that baptism of the Holy Ghost is *immersion* in the Holy Ghost,—a complete overwhelming of his sacred influence.*

* In an Appendix to Dr. Peters' work on Baptism are some extracts from the "*learned work,*" as Dr. P. calls it, of C. Taylor on Baptism. Mr. Taylor pompously speaks about the "perversions in which *industrious ignorance* and criminal presumption involve it." After quoting the above passages, in regard to the Holy Spirit, Mr. T. says, "These passages give us, as SYNONYMOUS with baptize: *sending down, coming, giving, falling, shedding, pouring, sitting* or *abiding, anointing, filling* and *sealing.* In all these *synonymous* words," &c. What shall we call this, — "industrious ignorance," or "criminal presumption," to say these words are synonymous with baptize? Who ever saw such words as these, totally different in meaning, called *synonyms* before? A man who has so little discrimination as Mr. Taylor, may well lecture others upon industrious ignorance and *criminal* presumption. But, in order to make these passages answer his purpose, Mr. T. must call these words synonymous! In mathematics, two things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other. If all these words are synonyms of baptize, they are synonyms of each other.

Various interpretations have been given to the "*baptism of fire.*" Some have thought it meant plunging into great afflictions, trials and persecutions; others, that it was synonymous with baptism of the Holy Ghost; others, that it denoted an overwhelming influence of love or zeal. Others have thought it denoted the plunging of the wicked into hell. The last, I think, is the meaning in Matt. iii. 11, and similar passages. John was addressing a promiscuous multitude of Jews, some Pharisees, some Sadducees. He says to them, "The axe is laid unto the root of the trees; therefore every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and *cast into the fire.*" Matt. iii. 10. John is distinctly declaring the final separation of the righteous and the wicked, and the destruction of the wicked in hell; cast into the fire, like a tree which bears evil fruit.

In verse 11 he continues the same thought,—"I indeed baptize you in water: he shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost and in fire." John did not mean that *all* whom he addressed would be baptized in the Holy Ghost, for he had just called many of them a generation of vipers, and refused to baptize them until they brought forth fruit meet for repentance. He meant that some—the righteous—would be bap-

---

Then breathing, coming, resting, giving, falling, &c., would all mean the same thing,—all express the same action. What could be more absurd!

tized in the Holy Ghost, and the others—the wicked —would be plunged into unquenchable fire. When he said to them, "I indeed baptize you in water," he did not mean that he baptized them all, for he evidently refused to baptize some of them. If he meant but part of them when he spoke of baptizing them in water, surely we may suppose he meant only a part when he said, "He shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost," and the other part when he added, "and in fire."

Dr. Robinson's Greek Lexicon, p. 126. "To overwhelm with fire unquenchable."

Gurtlerus. "*Baptism in fire* is a figurative expression, and signifies casting into a flame which, like water, flows far and wide." *R. Fuller*, p. 19.

Prof. Stuart, on this passage, says, "He will make a copious effusion of the Spirit upon a part of you, and another part, the finally impenitent, he will surround with flames, or plunge into the flames." *Stuart on Bap.* p. 74.

Ikenius. "The baptism of fire, or that which is performed in fire, must signify an immersion into fire." *R. Fuller*, p. 72.

The 12th verse continues the same idea and argument urged in the preceding verses, namely, the separation of the righteous and the wicked, and the destruction of the wicked in hell: "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire;" verse 10, "*cast*

into the fire;" verse 11, "*baptize in fire;*" verse 12, "*burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.*" The same idea and argument seem to run through the three verses.

Surely it does not mean that the wicked shall be *sprinkled* into hell, nor *poured* in, nor *washed* in, but *plunged* in. Nor can it mean *purified* in fire, unless we admit a purgatory.

Both these allusions, *baptism in the Holy Ghost* and *in fire*, so far as the act of baptism is concerned, most clearly teach the doctrine of immersion, and afford no evidence in favor of sprinkling.

CHAPTER XVIII.

BAPTISM OF SUFFERING.

Our Saviour's words—His approaching sufferings—How David spoke of great sufferings as waves and billows going over him—Witsius—Jeremiah—Ezekiel—Doddridge—Hervey—Trelawney—Bloomfield—Robinson—Wesley—Poole—Campbell—Stuart—Overwhelming suffering—Weak evasions.

Our Saviour represents his sufferings under the figure of a baptism, Matt. xx. 22, 23: "Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with."

Luke xii. 50. "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened until it be accomplished."

By this impressive figure, Jesus refers to approaching sufferings. What were the sufferings of Christ? Were they represented by a little sprinkling, or by an immersion, an overwhelming? How does the Psalmist speak of intense suffering?

Ps. xlii. 6, 7. "O my God, my soul is cast down within me,—*All thy waves and thy billows are gone over me.*"

WITSIUS. "*Immersion* into water is to be considered as exhibiting the dreadful abyss of divine justice, in which Christ for our sins was for a time, as it were, absorbed: as in David, his type, he complains, Ps. lxix. 2, 'I am come into deep waters where the floods overflow me.'" *Pengilly*, p. 23.

David also says, Ps. lxix. 14, 15, "Let me be delivered from them that hold me, and out of the deep waters. Let not the waterfloods overflow me, neither let the deep swallow me up, and let not the pit shut her mouth upon me."

Ps. lxxxviii. 7, and 16, 17. "Thy wrath lieth hard upon me, and thou has afflicted me with all thy waves. * * * Thy fierce wrath goeth over me; thy terrors have cut me off. They come round about me daily like water; they compassed me about together." Also Ps. cxxiv. 4, 5, Ps. xviii. 16, Ps. xxxii. 6.

How does Jeremiah also speak of great sufferings? Lam. iii. 54, "Waters flowed over my head: then I said, I am cut off." Also, Ezek. xxxii. 14.

By a similar figure our blessed Saviour speaks of his sufferings: "I have a baptism to be baptized with."

DODDRIDGE'S Family Expositor on this passage. "Are you able to drink the bitter cup of which I am about to drink so deep, and to be baptized with the baptism, and *plunged* into that sea of sufferings with which I am shortly to be baptized, and as it

were, *overwhelmed* for a time?" "I have indeed a most dreadful baptism to be baptized with; and I know that I shall shortly be bathed, as it were, in blood, and *plunged* in the most *overwhelming* distress."

HERVEY. "He was baptized with the baptism of his sufferings, *bathed* in blood, and *plunged* in death." *Pengilly*, p. 23.

SIR H. TRELAWNEY. "Here, I must acknowledge, our Baptist brethren have the advantage; for our Redeemer's sufferings must not be compared to a few drops of water sprinkled on the face, for he was *plunged* into distress, and environed with sorrows." *Pengilly*, p. 23.

BLOOMFIELD'S Greek Test. "This metaphor of *immersion* in water, as expressive of being overwhelmed by affliction, is *frequent*, both in the Scriptures and in classical writers." Vol. i. p. 97.

ROBINSON'S Greek Lexicon, p. 126. "Still in allusion to the rite: to baptize with calamities, *i. e.* to *overwhelm* with sufferings."

WESLEY'S Notes, p. 123. "Our Lord was *filled* with sufferings within, and *covered* with them without."

POOLE. "Afflictions are ordinarily compared in Scripture to waters." Compr. Comment. *in loco.*

CAMPBELL. "Phrases like these, to be *overwhelmed* with grief, to be *immersed* in affliction, are common in most languages." Compr. Comment. *in loco.*

PROF. STUART. "I have a baptism to be baptized with,—that is, I am about to be *overwhelmed* with sufferings, and I am greatly distressed with the prospect of them."

"Can ye indeed take upon you to undergo, patiently and submissively, sufferings like to mine—sufferings of an overwhelming and dreadful nature?" *Stuart on Bap.* p. 72.

The idea intended and expressed in these words of our Saviour, is an *overwhelming*, an immersion If he had understood baptism to be merely *sprinkling*, he never would have employed this metaphor to represent his sufferings. If Jesus meant *immersion* by the term *baptism* in this passage, it shows what he meant by the command to *baptize*, that is, to *immerse;* and sprinkling and pouring do not fulfil the command.

How sad are the weak quibblings of some advocates of sprinkling on these passages! One thinks it refers to the sprinkling of blood on his garments. But sprinkling of blood is not *suffering*. One may be sprinkled with blood and not suffer at all. It is his *sufferings* which he calls a *baptism*. I have heard one say that the passage did not refer to the *approaching* sufferings of Christ, but to some little present suffering he was then enduring. This he argued because Jesus says, "the baptism that I *am* baptized with;" while in the same verse he says, "Can ye drink of the cup that I *shall* drink of?"

And in Luke xii. 50, "I have a baptism *to be* baptized with." How flatly he contradicted the Saviour in order to avoid the force of this passage in favor of immersion! Surely, if ever we should be candid and truthful, we should be so in speaking of the sufferings of Christ.

CHAPTER XIX.

BAPTISM OF THE ISRAELITES UNTO MOSES.

Paul's words — The account in Exod. — A magnificent Burial — Witsius — Whitby — Peters contradicts Scripture account — The waters a wall, congealed — Hibbard — Cooke and Towne, and others—Perversion of Ps. lxxvii. 16–18—Commentators on it—Perversion of Ps. lxviii. 7–9 — Bishop Horne — All the storms which Pedobaptists would bring upon the Israelites in the Sea would have destroyed them—Prof. Stuart.

PAUL, in 1 Cor. x. 1, 2, uses the following language: "Moreover, brethren, I would not have you ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."

The passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, is recorded in Exodus xiv. 15–31. Verse 16, "Lift up thy rod, and stretch out thine hand over the sea, and divide it; and the children of Israel shall go on dry ground through the midst of the sea." Verse 19, "And the angel of God which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them. 20, And it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness

unto them, but it gave light by night to these, so that the one came not near the other all the night. 22, And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon dry ground, and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand and on their left."

It does not appear that any water *actually touched* them at all. Yet they were *under* the cloud and *in the sea.* Does the situation of the Israelites *in the cloud* and *in the sea* best agree to sprinkling *with water,* or a *total burial in it?*

Paul does not say they were baptized *by* the cloud and *by* the sea, but *in, under* the cloud and *in* the sea. The sea was a wall on either side of them, the cloud behind and over them; they were completely hidden from the view of all the world. A grand, magnificent *burial,* completely surrounded and covered by the cloud and the sea, it was one of the grandest immersions ever known, though not a drop of water touched them. Let us hear the views of some eminent Pedobaptists on this passage.

WITSIUS. "How were the Israelites baptized *in the cloud and in the sea,* seeing they were neither immersed in the sea, nor wetted by the cloud? It is to be considered that the apostle here uses the term 'baptism' in a figurative sense; yet there is some agreement to the external sign. The sea is water, and a cloud differs but little from water. The cloud hung over their heads, and the sea surrounded

them on each side; and so the water in regard to those that are baptized." *Pengilly*, p. 50

WHITBY. "They were covered by the sea on both sides, Exod. xiv. 22; so that both the cloud and the sea had some resemblance to our being covered with water in baptism. Their going into the sea resembled the ancient rite of going into the water; and their coming out of it, their rising up out of the water." *Ut supra.*

The efforts of some Pedobaptists to get the Israelites *sprinkled* in some way while going through the Red Sea only reveal the difficulty of the task they undertake, and utterly fail of proving their point.

DR. PETERS says, p. 65, "The strong east wind which divided the waters no doubt produced a dashing of the spray, which sprinkled them. In no other way could they have been baptized by the waters of the sea in the case here referred to."

But in Exod. xiv. 22 we are told "The waters were a *wall* unto them, on their right hand and on their left."

After they had crossed, Moses and the children of Israel sang a song of triumph, in which they say, Exod. xv. 8, "With the blast of thy nostrils the waters were gathered together, and *the floods stood upright as an heap*, and *the depths were* CONGEALED *in the heart of the sea.*"

Now did a solid *wall* sprinkle them? and did the *congealed* water which *stood upright as an heap*,

sprinkle them? Not a word is said, in the whole account of their passage, about their being sprinkled. If the spray had dashed enough to sprinkle all that multitude, they surely could not have gone over on dry ground, for a slight shower, and even a dew will wet the ground. Paul says they were all baptized; then, if sprinkling was the baptism, they were all sprinkled, and the dashing of spray sufficiently distant from the sides of that vast multitude to reach those in the centre, would not only have wet the ground, but endangered or destroyed the lives of those nearest the waters.

Dr. Hibbard also thinks they were wet by the dashing of the spray of the sea. Whereas the Bible says not a word about the dashing of spray, but forbids the idea, and says the waters were a *wall*—stood *upright* and were *congealed*.

But the advocates of sprinkling would make out that they were baptized *twice* while going through the Red Sea, once by the spray of the sea, and once by rain from the cloud over them; though it was a cloud of *fire* on the side toward the Israelites.

But Dr. Cooke and Mr. Towne plainly contradict Drs. Peters, Hibbard, and Slicer, about the dashing of the spray, and say, "The droppings from the cloud as they were passing, was their baptism, and the *only* way in which they were *wet at all*." *Hints to an Inq.* p. 9.

A multitude of Pedobaptist writers, among whom are Wesley, Hay, Slicer, Hibbard, Peters, Watson,

and others, have told us it *rained* on the Israelites while passing through the sea. They quote Ps. lxxvii. 16, 17, 18, in proof. "The waters saw thee, O God; the waters saw thee; they were afraid, the depths also were troubled. The clouds poured out water, the skies sent out a sound, thine arrows also went abroad. The voice of thy thunder was in the heaven, the lightnings lightened the world, the earth trembled and shook."

Did the *fiery* side of that cloud pour out water on the Israelites? Pouring out water by the clouds indicates a heavy, drenching rain. Did that fall on the Israelites in the midst of the sea? If so, they did not go over on *dry ground.* But we are repeatedly told in the Bible that they went through on *dry ground.* Hence that pouring rain mentioned in the above passage certainly did *not* fall on the Israelites, but on the Egyptians who pursued them, and it destroyed them all. "Thine *arrows* also went abroad, the skies sent out a *sound,*" indicating God's wrath, not towards the Israelites, but towards the Egyptians. The following is the comment of

Lowth, Whitby, Arnold, Patrick and Lowman, on this passage, vol. ii. p. 910. "The waters of the Red Sea felt thy power, O God, they felt thy power to the very bottom of them, which so disturbed them that they retreated as if they had been affrighted by thy presence, and left a plain way for thy people to march through upon dry ground; but

returned again upon the Egyptians, who pursued after us, accompanied with a *terrible storm of rain*, and thunder and hailstones, which flew about their ears, and brake the very wheels of their chariots. Ex. xiv. 24, 25."

Surely, then, the rain mentioned in Ps. 77 did not fall on the Israelites. But they quote also Ps. lxviii. 7, 8, 9. "When thou didst march through the *wilderness*, [not through the Red Sea,] the heavens dropped at the presence of God. *Sinai* was moved. Thou, O God, didst send a *plentiful rain*, whereby *thou didst confirm thine inheritance when it was weary*."

This describes a rain when the Israelites were near Sinai, long after they crossed the Red Sea. That plentiful rain, too, was given to confirm his inheritance when it was weary, marching in the desert, and parched with thirst. Such a plentiful rain also would have wet the earth so they could not have gone through the sea on dry ground, if the rain had fallen upon them then.

The above mentioned commentary says on Ps. lxviii. 7–9, "The earth trembled, yea the heavens dissolved in thunder, lightning and rain, (Ex. xix. 16,) when Divine majesty descended upon *Mount Sinai*. The mountain itself quaked before his glorious majesty, who is still present with his people Israel, for whom, O God, thou didst miraculously provide, by sending them liberal showers in those dry and desert places; and having chosen them for thine

own peculiar people, didst rain down bread from heaven, to refresh and strengthen them when they were weary."

Bishop Geo. Horne, on Ps. lxviii. 8, 9, says, "The prophet goes back to commemorate the wonders wrought for Israel when Jehovah, by his presence in the cloudy pillar, conducted them through the wilderness; when descending *to deliver the law*, he bowed the heavens and shook the earth, and caused Sinai to quake from its foundations."

Yet Drs. Peters, Hibbard and Watson, Wesley, Hay, Slicer and others, are so anxious to get the Israelites *sprinkled* in going through the Red Sea, that they would bring upon them that terrible storm which destroyed the Egyptians, and bring another clear from the desert around *Sinai*, and have that spray of the sea dashing over them during their miraculous passage.

Surely, if all those storms which Pedobaptists say came upon the Israelites in the sea had actually fallen upon them, that *plentiful rain*, the clouds *pouring* out water, when God's *arrows* went abroad, with the sea surging and dashing its spray over them, they would have perished in the sea. But they were not sprinkled at all, so far as we know, in making that wonderful passage.

Prof. Stuart, p. 113. "They went through the sea on *dry* ground. Yet they were baptized in the cloud and in the sea. The reason and ground of such an expression must be, so far as I can discern,

a surrounding of the Israelites on different sides by the cloud and by the sea, although neither the cloud nor the sea touched them. It is therefore a kind of figurative mode of expression, derived from the idea that *baptizing* is surrounding with a fluid."

CHAPTER XX.

BAPTISM ON THE DAY OF PENTECOST.

Scripture account of it—*Was there time to immerse* three thousand?—Third hour—Seventy-five administrators could baptize all in forty minutes, at the rate of one each per minute—Was there water sufficient?—Ten lavers in the temple holding ten barrels each—Pool of Bethesda covering an acre of ground—Pool of Solomon, or King's Pool—Pool of Siloam—Old or Upper Pool, covering an acre and a-half—Pool of Hezekiah, covering three-quarters of an acre—Lower Pool of Gihon, covering three acres—Other reservoirs—Dr. Samson's testimony—Josephus—Pedobaptists contradict the Bible—Wesley—Dr. Peters—Dr. Hibbard—Dr. Cooke and Mr. Towne—Dr. Rice—Dr. Fairchild—Mr. Hay—Mr. McLeod—Mr. Hall—Testimony of Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem.

THE first great revival of religion, after the resurrection of Christ, occurred on the day of Pentecost, in the city of Jerusalem. Peter and the other apostles preached the gospel, aided by marvellous gifts of the Holy Spirit, and the people "were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? And Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts ii. 37, 38. "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and

the same day were added unto them about three thousand souls." Acts ii. 41. "And they continuing daily with one accord in the *temple*, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God and having favor with all the people." Acts ii. 46, 47.

Were the three thousand sprinkled, poured, or immersed? They were *baptized.* The meaning of the word *baptizo* tells what was done to them. They were immersed.

WAS THERE TIME TO IMMERSE THEM?

There were *twelve* apostles, (for Matthias had been chosen to fill the place of Judas, Acts i. 26,) and there were *seventy* other ordained ministers whom Christ had sent forth to preach and heal in his name. Luke x. 1. The number of disciples assembled to pray for the special gift of the Spirit and to wait for it in Jerusalem, was about one hundred and twenty. Acts i. 15. The twelve and the seventy make eighty-two administrators. But suppose there were but seventy-five administrators, and they baptized one each in a minute—a time amply sufficient—then they would baptize one hundred and fifty in two minutes, three hundred in four minutes, and three thousand in forty minutes. But it is not difficult to immerse two candidates in one minute; so that, if only the twelve administered the ordinance, and each baptized two hundred and fifty persons, occupying half a minute with each, it would require but

two hours and five minutes to immerse the three thousand. It was but the third hour of the day, nine o'clock in the morning, (v. 15,) when Peter commenced preaching to them. There was ample *time* and *administrators* to immerse the three thousand.

WAS THERE WATER SUFFICIENT?

They had free access to the *temple*. Acts ii. 46, "They continuing daily with one accord *in the temple*." Luke says that after the ascension of Christ "They worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy, and were continually *in the temple* praising and blessing God." Luke xxiv. 52, 53. In the temple were ten lavers of brass, each holding about ten barrels of water. *There were also, within one mile of the temple, at least six public fountains and pools*, to which the people had free access, and which were adapted to the immersion of large numbers immediately. They are as follows:—

1. THE POOL OF BETHESDA. John v. 2–4. "Now there is at Jerusalem by the sheep market a pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda, having five porches. In these lay a great multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water. For an angel went down at a certain season in the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had."

This pool was near the temple, and covered more

than an acre of ground. It was surrounded by five porches, and accessible to everybody. Great multitudes were actually in the habit of bathing in it at their pleasure. Pedobaptists object to this as a fit place for immersion, for they say the sacrifices were washed in it, and some say the offal and filth from the sacrifices were thrown into it. This last statement is incredible, for it would soon have bred a pestilence there. Eusebius, the Church historian, three hundred years after Christ, says it was in "two lakes; one of which is filled usually by the winter rains, the other of which, in a wonderful manner tinged with red, as if by bloody waters, witnessing the marks of ancient work done in it." *I. Chase, D.D., on Bap.* p. 121. Certainly the people did bathe there, as Luke informs us. Its five porches, its ample supply of water, its large area, its easy accessibility, rendered it an admirable place for immersion.

2. The King's Pool or Pool of Solomon. Neh. ii. 14. This is in the hill-side, above which towers the walls of the temple. Dr. Robinson says from the side toward the temple, through an arched passage way, enters a copious stream of water, which goes out on the opposite side through a passage large enough to stand up in. The water in the basin formed by the floor of this chamber is from one to three feet deep. *Robinson's Researches*, vol. i. pp. 500–502. An admirable place for immersion.

3. The Pool of Siloam. John ix. 7. "Go wash

in the Pool of Siloam." This is about a quarter of a mile from the King's Pool. Dr. Robinson's account of it is in his Researches, vol. i. p. 497. It is fifty-three feet long, eighteen broad, and, though the wall is partly broken down, the water is yet two or three feet deep in it. Dr. R. mentions still another reservoir near this, having a descent by steps to the bottom.

Josephus, who was born A. D. 37, and resided in Jerusalem, and consequently knew the condition of these pools during the apostolic age, says of "Siloam—That is the name of a fountain which hath sweet water in it, and that in great plenty." *Dr. I. Chase*, p. 126.

The Bourdeaux Pilgrim, who visited Palestine before Constantine's day, says, "The pool which is called Siloam has four porticos; there is another large pool without." *Chase*, p. 126. These were accessible to all, as is proved by our Saviour's directing the blind man to go there and wash. Here was another admirable place for immersion.

4. THE OLD OR UPPER POOL. 2 Kings, xviii. 17 "And when they were come up, they came and stood by the conduit of the upper pool, which is in the highway of the fuller's field." Isa. vii. 3. Eccl. ii. 6. Isa. xxii. 11. 2 Chron. xxxii. 30.

This pool is about half a mile northwest from the *Castle of David*, at the western gate. Dr. Robinson says its length is three hundred and sixteen feet, breadth two hundred and eighteen, depth

eighteen feet, covering more than an acre and a half of ground. Here was ample water for the immersion of the whole three thousand.

5. The Pool of Hezekiah. 2 Kings, xx. 20. "Hezekiah made a pool and a conduit, and brought water into the city." This was at the west gate of the city, near Mount Calvary, says Jerome, who calls it the Dragon Fountain. The Crusaders called it the Pool of the Holy Sepulchre. Dr. Robinson says it is two hundred and forty feet long, one hundred and forty-four feet broad, covering three-quarters of an acre of ground. To this day, the people freely descend to wash, and to fill their water jars. It is supplied by an aqueduct from the Upper Pool, which passes under the wall near the Yaffa Gate. The bottom of the pool is *sloping*, and thus favorable for descent into the water. *Dr. I. Chase*, p. 132. An excellent and ample place for immersion.

6. The Lower Pool of Gihon. 2 Chron. xxxii. 3, 4, 30. "Hezekiah took counsel with his princes and his mighty men to stop the waters of the fountains which were without the city," &c.

This pool is about a quarter of a mile south of the western gate of the city. It is rather a pond than a pool, formed by two dams across the valley. The immense aqueduct from the Pools of Solomon, south of Bethlehem, crosses the valley about fifteen rods above the upper end of this pool. The pool was probably supplied by rains, by water from this aqueduct, and by water from the Upper Pool, from

which a covered passage comes into the upper dam or wall. According to Dr. Robinson, it covers more than three acres of ground. In the days of the Crusaders it was well supplied with water. It was doubtless well supplied in the time of our Saviour What more suitable place need there be for immersion of a large number than is here presented?

OTHER PLACES FOR IMMERSION AT JERUSALEM.

Dr. G. W. Samson, who visited Jerusalem a few years ago, thus speaks:

"Underneath the grotto of Jeremiah, near the northern wall of Jerusalem, is such a reservoir. Entering a side door, and descending a few feet, the traveller finds himself in a fine ante-room, twenty or twenty-five feet square, cut in the rock. Passing through a side door and descending a stairway twenty-five or thirty feet further, he stands in a large subterranean hall, about sixty feet square, whose arched top is supported by columns, and whose sloping bottom is nearly covered with water, into which he can descend to a considerable depth." *Chase*, pp. 117, 118

Josephus, who lived and wrote in Jerusalem in the apostles' days, mentions other reservoirs and costly fountains which Herod built before Christ's day, in Ascalon, Cæsarea, and Herodion, and in *different quarters of Jerusalem*, as under the towers of Hippicus and Phasaelus, and of Antonia, the castle into which Paul was borne *Josephus, An-*

tiq. XV. 9, 4, 6. *Wars,* I. 21, 10, 11. V. 4, 2–5, 8. *Ut supra.*

Here were, then, in various parts of the city and immediately around it, the most ample and convenient places for the immersion of any number of converts, and these places were accessible, and great multitudes were actually in the habit of resorting to some of them, and bathing in them at their pleasure.

The disciples of Jesus at this time, we are expressly told, had free access to the temple; and instead of the people being exasperated against them, they had "favor with all the people." Acts ii. 47. Not long after the day of Pentecost, previous to the martyrdom of Stephen, we are told "The word of God increased; and the number of disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly, and a *great company* of *the priests* were obedient to the faith." Acts vi. 7.

* * * * * *

"Fear came upon every soul, and many signs and wonders were done by the apostles." Acts ii. 43.

Thus we see that on the day of Pentecost, and for a time afterward, they were not hindered in their work of preaching the gospel, neither by the *priests* nor *people,* but had great encouragement and great success.

Let us now hear what Pedobaptists say of the baptism at Pentecost, in order to avoid the idea that the three thousand were immersed. We shall see

some singular specimens of ignorance or perversion on the part of the learned advocates of sprinkling.

WHAT PEDOBAPTISTS SAY OF THE BAPTISMS AT PENTECOST.

JOHN WESLEY. "Three thousand at one time, and five thousand at another, were converted and baptized by *St. Peter* at Jerusalem; *where they had none but the gentle waters of Siloam*, according to the observation of Mr. Fuller, 'There were no water mills at Jerusalem, because there was no stream large enough to drive them.' The place, therefore, as well as the number, makes it highly probable that all these were baptized by sprinkling or pouring.'" *Methodist Doctrinal Tracts*, p. 245.

Here are several palpable errors. 1. The Scriptures nowhere say the three thousand or the five thousand were baptized by Peter. 2. There were other waters in abundance in Jerusalem beside the "gentle Siloam." 3. Because there were no *water mills* there, he thinks they could not have been immersed. Are there any *water mills* on the *Jordan*, though there is a stream large enough to propel them? Any in New York city, Chicago, or London? Yet people are immersed in all these places.

DR. PETERS. "Where could the apostles have baptized three thousand converts by *immersion?* There was no river, nor brook, to which they could resort in a short time, and only *two public pools* or

bathing places in Jerusalem, Bethesda, and Siloam. Bethesda was used daily for cleansing sacrifices, and the blood and offals of the sacrifices were washed into it which, some have imagined, may have imparted to the water its healing virtue. At least it must have been an *unfit* place for immersion. It was also in the hands of the priests, the avowed and mortal enemies of Christ and his disciples. They surely *would not have given up* the pool of Bethesda to the apostles to be used as a place of Christian baptism. It is probable also that both Siloam and Bethesda were of insufficient dimensions to allow the eleven apostles to use them at the same time for the purpose of immersion." *Peters on Bap.* pp. 85, 86.

Dr. Peters' errors. 1. "No river or brook." The fountains of Gihon furnished a pond of more than three acres. The *brook Kedron* was not far distant. 2. "Only two public pools." I have shown more than six. 3. "Bethesda *unfit* for immersion," though John v. 2–4, says, great multitudes actually did go into it to bathe. 4. "Would not give up Bethesda for immersion," though the Scripture says they had favor with all the people, and a great company of the priests were soon obedient to the faith. 5. "Bethesda and Siloam too small," though Bethesda covered more than an acre of ground, and had five porches.

Dr. Hibbard. "They had no place for the immersion of such a multitude. As to public pools,

we have account of only two, Bethesda and Siloam Bethesda was in the hands of the priests. It will not be pretended that they would have surrendered their claims to the use of Bethesda, in order to accommodate the apostles with a place for Christian baptism. Both Siloam and Bethesda were probably of inadequate dimensions to admit twelve men, (much less the seventy disciples,) for the purpose of immersing." *Hibbard on Bap.*, Part ii. p. 113.

Dr. Hibbard's errors. 1. "No place" for immersing so many. 2. "Only two public pools." 3. Priests would not permit them to use Bethesda. 4. They were of "inadequate dimensions."

Dr. Cooke and Mr. Towne. "The brook Cedron was dry except in the rainy part of the year. The city afforded no other brook or stream suited to the purposes of immersion. If there were baths, the Jews would sooner have opened them to *swine* than to the followers of the hated Nazarene. Where did the apostles find a convenient place in Jerusalem to immerse in one day three thousand converts? How could they have immersed three thousand in so short a time? It must have been at least four o'clock P. M. before they could have *commenced* baptizing. As the converts were *strangers*, where did they get changes of apparel?" *Cooke and Towne's Hints to an Inquirer*, pp. 46, 47.

The errors of Dr. Cooke and Mr. Towne are too obvious to need pointing out.

Dr. Rice. "The disciples were together in a house

in Jerusalem. It is not possible that three thousand persons were immersed in that house in one day, and no intimation is given that they left the place where they were assembled to go after water. Where did the apostles find sufficient water for the immersion of so many; if they left the house, could they find any stream of sufficient depth? There is no such stream in or near Jerusalem. Did the Jews, who had so recently crucified our Saviour, open to them their public or private baths or cisterns, &c.? Who can believe it?" *Rice on Bap.* p. 120.

Dr. Rice's errors: 1. It is not said the three thousand were baptized *in a house.* 2. There was an abundance of water convenient for immersion in Jerusalem. 3. They had *favor* with all the people, instead of being opposed, as Dr. Rice intimates.

Dr. Fairchild. "There were within the area of the temple immense subterranean reservoirs, supplied by aqueducts; and so there were cisterns underneath many private dwellings, but these could be no more available for immersion *than a common well.* Then, though there were large pools or tanks in or near the city, they *were not so constructed* as to allow a number of persons at the same time to make use of them for immersing others. Where did they obtain the necessary garments?" *Fairchild on Bap* pp. 73, 74.

Dr. Fairchild's errors: 1. In saying their reservoirs and cisterns were no more available for immersion that common wells. This is flatly contra-

dicted by Josephus, Dr. Robinson, Dr. Samson, and others who have personally visited them and described them. 2. In saying that the public pools and tanks were not so constructed as to allow persons to immerse others. 3. Their changes of raiment were not far away; for if they resided in Jerusalem, their clothing was near: if they were strangers from *different countries*, they would not be so far from home without suitable changes, especially as Oriental wealth consisted in a great degree in *changes of raiment.*

Mr. Hay, (Episcopalian, commended by Bishop Chase.) "We will not say that there were not conveniences for baptizing this number of people by immersion, either in pools or baths at Jerusalem. But that they would have been permitted to use them without molestation by the priests, and many others of the Jews, is not easy to be believed. They could not have been provided with changes of apparel." *Hay on Bap.* pp. 30, 31.

These errors have already been exposed and refuted.

Alexander W. McLeod, Methodist. "There was in Jerusalem no large collection of water. If much water be necessary, then the baptism of the three thousand at Jerusalem could not have been by immersion, because there was *not* much water there." *McLeod on Bap.* p. 34.

Now let us read 2 Chron. xxxii. 4. "So there was gathered much people together who stopped all the

fountains and the brook that ran through the midst of the land, saying, Why should the kings of Assyria come and find *much water?*" Hezekiah says there was *much water* there, and he gathered *much people* to stop it off, lest Sennacherib should come and enjoy the benefit of it for his vast army. But Alexander McLeod contradicts Hezekiah and the Scripture.

Mr. M. also speaks of "shortness of time," which has been proved amply sufficient for their immersion.

Also, "There must have been twelve distinct places or accommodations for baptizing." The Pool of Bethesda would accommodate twice that number. The Pool of Gihon and the Upper Pool a hundred more administrators, if they were needed. But, says Mr. McLeod, "The disciples were almost universally detested." This flatly contradicts the Scripture, which says they had "favor with all the people."

Edwin Hall. "On the day of Pentecost,—the brook Kedron was dry, and, save the Pool of Siloam, no living fountain gladdened the city,—three thousand were baptized in a small part of one day. All at once, and very conveniently, there are discovered a number of *reservoirs* and *baths*. These can belong only to the rich." *Hall on Bap.* p. 90.

To Mr. Hall these *reservoirs* and *baths* may have been a "discovery," but to a common reader of the Bible they were well known. In what sense did

those great public pools, covering acres of ground, and accessible to "great multitudes of impotent folk" and everybody else, "belong only to the rich?"

Why do all these Pedobaptist authors so plainly contradict the Scriptures by their statements about the baptism of the three thousand at Pentecost? A just cause requires no such "handling of the word of God deceitfully." The Scriptures themselves show an abundance of water and every desired facility for the immersion of three thousand at Jerusalem, plenty of administrators, and plenty of time. But to evade the force of the argument for immersion, these Pedobaptist authors again and again contradict some of the plainest facts in Scripture.

Cyril, the bishop of Jerusalem, A. D. 374, and who had the best of opportunities of knowing how baptism had been administered there from the days of the apostles, does not seem to find any of these difficulties of immersing people in Jerusalem, lack of water, &c. He says, "As he who is plunged in the water and baptized is encompassed by the water on every side, so they that are baptized by the Spirit are wholly covered all over." See p. 113.

Cyril tells us how baptism was actually administered in Jerusalem, and that it was an immersion.

The desperate but unsuccessful efforts of Pedobaptist writers to show the impossibility of the immersion of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, their apparent ignorance concerning those vast public pools and reservoirs, their positive con-

tradiction of the Scriptures, afford striking examples of the influence of prejudice in perverting the judgment and in blinding the mind to the plainest facts. They show also what sectarianism will do to carry its point. Let us write and speak on this question, as well as upon all others, in view of the solemnities of the judgment day.

CHAPTER XXI.

BAPTISM OF THE ETHIOPIAN EUNUCH.

Bible account of it—Looks like immersion—Went *into* the water after they came *to* it—*eis*, into—Examples from the New Testament—Infidel and Pedobaptist minister—*Ek* and *ex, out of*—Change of raiment—Was there water enough for immersion?—Dr. Robinson and Dr. Samson's testimony—"So shall he *sprinkle* many nations"—Astonish many nations—*Sprinkle* is not the meaning of the original—Septuagint, *astonish*—Calvin—Doddridge—Dr. Rice's assertion.

THE scriptural account of the baptism of the eunuch by Philip is found in Acts viii. 26–40. Please read the whole account. For the sake of brevity I will quote only a part.

36–39. "And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water: what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch: and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, and the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing."

Does this account of the baptism of the eunuch look like an example of sprinkling, pouring, or immersion? Will not Pedobaptists have to search for "queer meanings" for these words, even to permit the idea of sprinkling? Here everything, in its plain common sense meaning, favors immersion; and all the circumstances appear absurd and ridiculous, if the baptism was merely a sprinkling or pouring.

Why did they leave the chariot, if sprinkling only was to be done? A servant could have brought a little water, and the eunuch could have been sprinkled in his chariot. Why did they go down *into* the water? And why did *both* go in, if the eunuch was only to be sprinkled?

The opponents of immersion have said they only went down *to* the water, not *into* it. But the Scriptures positively declare they went *into* the water. Previous to their going down *into* the water, we are told, they "came *unto* a certain water," and after they had come *unto* it, we are told, "they went down *into* the water." Now, it would not be *twice* declared they came *to* the water. But they came to it, and then went down into it. This was necessary for immersion, but *not* necessary for sprinkling or pouring.

The Greek preposition *eis* signifies, as our translators have rendered it, *into*, and not merely *to*,—*eis to hudor*, into the water. In the book of Matthew, this preposition *eis* is translated by *into* one hundred and thirty-two times. In Mark it is thus

translated eighty-two times; in Luke ninety-five; in John sixty-five, and in Acts seventy-seven times. Thus in the first five books of the New Testament *eis* is translated *into* four hundred and fifty-one times. When it is translated *to* or *at* it generally means *into*, as we say a man has gone *to* New York; we mean not that he will stop just outside of the city, but will go *into* it. Independence Hall is *at* Philadelphia. We do not mean it is just at the edge of the city, but *in* it. In this very chapter, Acts viii., it is translated by other words, but the meaning is *into* in every instance. Verse 3, "Committed them *to* prison." Surely they were put *into* the prison. 5. "Philip went down to the city of Samaria." Did he not go *into* it? 25. "Returned *to* Jerusalem." Did they go *into* Jerusalem? 27. "Went down from Jerusalem *unto* Gaza." 40. "Philip was found *at* Azotus." Does not this mean *into* Gaza and *in* Azotus?

EXAMPLES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT—USAGE OF *EIS* WHERE WATER IS MENTIONED.

Matt. iv. 18. Casting a net *into* the sea.

Matt viii. 32. The whole herd of swine ran violently down a steep place *into* the sea, and perished in the waters.

Matt. xiii. 47. The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net that was cast *into* the sea.

Matt. xvii. 15. Ofttimes he falleth into the fire and *into* the water.

Mark i. 9. Jesus was baptized of John *in* Jordan.

Mark v. 13. The herd ran violently down a steep place *into* the sea.

Mark ix. 22. Ofttimes it casteth him into the fire and *into* the waters.

Mark ix. 42. Better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and he were cast *into* the sea.

Luke viii. 31. They besought him that he would not command them to go out *into* the deep. 33. The herd ran violently down a steep place *into* the lake and were choked.

Luke xvii. 2. Millstone hanged about his neck, and he cast *into* the sea.

John v. 7. The impotent man answered, Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me *into* the pool.

John xxi. 7. Did cast his fisher's coat about him, (for he was naked,) and did cast himself *into* the sea.

Acts viii. 38. They went down both *into* the water, both Philip and the eunuch.

Acts xxvii. 38. And they lightened the ship and cast out the wheat *into* the sea.

Rev. viii. 8. A great mountain burning with fire was cast *into* the sea.

Rev. xviii. 21. A mighty angel took a stone like a great millstone and cast it *into* the sea.

These examples prove conclusively that in the New Testament the preposition *eis, into,* when used in connection with water, does mean *into.* All the efforts of Pedobaptists cannot disprove this position,

or refute the certain evidence of the fact which these examples afford.

How utterly absurd would these passages all be, if you give *eis* the meaning of *at* or *to!*

A Pedobaptist minister was once persuading his hearers to believe that Philip and the eunuch did not go *into* the water, but only *to* it. An infidel hearer, at the close of the sermon, congratulated the minister that he had relieved his mind of a great difficulty in reference to the Bible. "For," said he, "I could never believe that Daniel was cast *into* a lion's den and came out safe, nor that Shadrach, Meshack and Abednego were cast *into* the fiery furnace and came out unburnt. But your argument to-day makes it all very easy. There was no miracle about it. Daniel was only cast *at* or *near* the lion's den, and the three worthies went *to* or *near* the furnace, but not *into* it. No wonder they all escaped safely!"

If the Pedobaptist argument be correct, then the herd of swine only went down *to* the sea, and were all drowned on dry ground, and the fishermen cast their nets *upon* the *shore near* the sea, in order to catch fish!

The reader may settle this fact in his mind, that Philip and the eunuch went *into* the water. I see not how any fact can be more plainly proved.

Having shown what is the force and meaning of the preposition *eis*, *into*, every one can readily see what is the meaning of *ek*, *out of* the water. If

they went *into* the water they must have come up *out of* it, whether *ek* signifies *out of* or not. But *ek* does signify *out of*. *Ek* and *ex* are prefixes used by us in English to denote *out of*. An *ex*-president is a president *out of* office; *ex-officio* out of or by virtue of office; *ex*-pel to drive out, *ex*-hume to take *out of* the earth, *ex*-tract to draw *out*. So Philip and the eunuch came up *ek tou hudatos, out of the water*.

I have heard an advocate for sprinkling insist that the eunuch was not immersed, because he had not a *change* of *raiment* with him, and Dr. Fairchild urges a similar reason for thinking the converts on the day of Pentecost were not immersed, p. 74. In reference to the eunuch, the Scriptures present us a few *facts*.

1. He was a man of distinction and wealth, "of great authority under Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, who had the charge of all her treasure." Acts viii. 27.

2. He was travelling far from home, travelling in great state, in a chariot, not on camels or horses or on foot, as common men. Yet some of the advocates of sprinkling will not allow that he had a single change of raiment with him!

3. Read the following from Horne's Introduction to the Bible, vol. ii. p. 159. "A prodigious number of sumptuous and magnificent habits was in ancient times regarded as a *necessary and indispensable part of their treasures*. The circumstance of amass-

ing and ostentatiously displaying in wardrobes numerous and superb suits, *as indispensable to the idea of wealth*, and *forming a principal part of the opulence of those times*, will elucidate several passages of Scripture. Job xxvii. 16, Gen. xlv. 22, Joseph gave Benjamin *five changes* of raiment. 2 Kings v. 5, Naaman carried as a present to the prophet Elisha *ten changes* of raiment. Matt. vi. 19, Lay not up for yourselves *treasures* on earth where *moth* and rust do corrupt. Acts xx. 33, I have coveted no man's gold, silver, or *apparel*. James v. 2, Your *riches* are corrupted and your *garments* moth eaten. The fashion of hoarding up splendid dresses still subsists in Palestine."

Yet Pedobaptists object to the immersion of the converts on the day of Pentecost, and of the Ethiopian eunuch who had charge of all the treasures of a kingdom, and was travelling in great state and far from home, for the want of a single change of raiment!

If those converts at Pentecost, consisting of Parthians, Medes, Elamites, dwellers in Mesopotamia, Judea, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Egypt, Libya and Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians, and also the Ethiopian eunuch, were so destitute of clothing as some Pedobaptists say they were, they were in a pitiable case, and objects of charity. The truth is, that they were possessed of sufficient wealth to enable them to leave their homes in distant countries and come up

to Jerusalem. That they had not a single change of raiment no one would believe except a wild advocate of sprinkling, himself sadly destitute of arguments to sustain his cause.

But was there water enough between Jerusalem and Gaza, to immerse the eunuch?

Pedobaptists have urged the want of water as an objection to the immersion of the eunuch.

Dr. Fairchild says, "They were surrounded by arid wastes and burning sands," p. 81. Dr. Peters speaks of "Springs in the desert," but thinks there was not water enough for immersion, p. 97. Dr. Hibbard says the word *desert*, used in verse 26, "sometimes means a barren waste, and sometimes merely a *country* place, in contradistinction of a city," vol. ii. p. 104. Which does it mean here? John the Baptist preached in the wilderness (desert) of Judea. The word *wilderness* (*eremos*) in Matt. iii. 1 is the same word in the Greek as the word *desert* (*eremos*) in Acts viii. 26. Now did John the Baptist preach amid "arid wastes and burning sands," where there was no water? His preaching place in the *desert* of Judea was on the *banks of the Jordan*. Yet though on the bank of that river, he preached in the desert; that is, a country but little inhabited. So the desert between Jerusalem and Gaza is not "arid wastes and burning sands," but a country then not much inhabited. Modern travellers have described it. Dr. Barclay speaks of it as a comparatively fertile and populous region,

(Fairchild, p. 82.) It could not have been an "arid waste" in the days of Philip and the eunuch.

Dr. Robinson, a Pedobaptist, and Dr. Samson, a Baptist, have within a few years visited Palestine, and concur in describing that region. They shall tell us whether there are suitable places and water enough for immersion on the road from Jerusalem to Gaza. On the route by way of Hebron are the following waters:

1. Seven and a half miles from Jerusalem are three immense pools of Solomon, from which water was conducted to Jerusalem. These covered three acres of ground. *Robinson's Researches*, vol. i. p. 545.

2. Seven miles further on are the ruins of Howoffnee or Abu Fid, and a reservoir of water in an open field, with a grassy brink around it. It is built of large hewn stone, evidently ancient, and is fifty or sixty feet square, the water from three to five feet deep, a splendid place for immersion. *Robinson's Researches*, vol. i. p. 320.

Along in front of the old town and pool, a fine old Roman road, paved with stones, and having neat curbing stones at the side, may be traced in the grass some distance down the hill-side towards Jerusalem; as evident a carriage road as the old Appian way now seen south of Rome. *Dr. Samson, in I. Chase, D. D. on Bap.* p. 159.

3. Bethsur, twenty miles from Jerusalem, and one mile from Eleutheropolis. In front of the for-

tress is a fine gushing fountain of sweet water, and broad stone troughs. "It is hardly conceivable," says Dr. Samson, "that, in the days of Herod, the fountain builder, this most favorable spring should not have been made to supply a pool, in this land of such structures."

4. Tellel-Hasy, mentioned by Dr. Robinson, vol. ii. pp. 380, 641. Many others, equally favorable, might be mentioned on the same road.

There is abundant water, then, for immersion on the road from Jerusalem to Gaza. An excellent article on the supply of water in Palestine is published from the pen of Dr. Samson, in the work of Dr. I. Chase on Baptism.

What was the eunuch reading when Philip came to him?

Pedobaptists have urged with great zeal, that the eunuch was reading Isa. lii. 15, where our English version says "so shall he *sprinkle* many nations." Hence they say he here learned the duty and mode of baptism.

But the passage quoted in Acts from Isaiah as the passage which the eunuch was reading, is found not in the fifty-second chapter of Isaiah, but in the fifty-third. Yet, admitting that the eunuch had read the fifty-second chapter, he did not read, "*so shall he sprinkle many nations,*" for the passage does not read thus either in the Hebrew or Septuagint version of the Old Testament.

The common English scholar can see by turning

to the passage, Isaiah lii. 14, 15, that it does not mean, so shall he sprinkle many nations, but so shall he *astonish* or *cause to rejoice* many nations. Verse 14. "As many were *astonied* at thee,—15, so shall he *astonish* many nations." *So*, in the 15th verse, is the correlative of *as* in the 14th, and should be followed by a similar word. *Sprinkle* is wholly unlike astonied or astonished, and cannot express the true meaning. The 15th verse carries the idea of *astonishment* all the way through it. "The kings shall shut their mouths at him: for that which had not been told them they shall see; and that which they had not heard, shall they consider."

If the eunuch was reading the Old Testament in Hebrew, he read, "So shall he *nazah* many nations." What is the meaning of the Hebrew word *nazah*?

GESENIUS' Hebrew Lexicon, p. 658, thus defines it. "*Nazah*, to leap, to spring, *to exult, to leap for joy*; when applied to liquids, to spirt, to spatter, to be sprinkled." Now note particularly that in this passage it is *not* applied to *liquids*, but to *nations*. So shall he *nazah* many *nations*, not *nazah liquids*. So, according to Gesenius, it must mean in this passage, so shall he cause many nations to *exult* or *leap for joy*. In fact, Gesenius quotes this very passage in proof of that meaning.

GEORGE R. NOYES, Prof. of Hebrew in Harvard University, in his New Translation of the Hebrew Prophets, 1833, renders Isaiah lii. 14, 15,

"As many were amazed at the sight of him,—
So disfigured and scarcely human was his visage,
And his form so unlike that of a man,—
So shall many nations *exult* on account of him,
And kings shall shut their mouths before him;
For what had never been told them shall they see,
And what they never heard shall they perceive."

But we have still stronger proof that the Hebrew word does not mean *to sprinkle* in this passage. About two hundred and eighty-five years before Christ, the Old Testament was translated from Hebrew into Greek by seventy-two learned Jewish rabbis. Their translation is called the Septuagint version, and is now in the library of almost every scholar. These seventy-two Jewish rabbis surely knew *beyond question* the meaning of the Hebrew word *nazah*. They have translated it in this passage by the Greek word *thaumazo*, to *astonish*,—a word which never in Greek signifies to *sprinkle*. *Astonish* is the meaning, say these Jews themselves.

Archbishop Leighton. "As many were astonished at him, his visage being marred more than any man, they shall be as much *astonished* at his beauty and glory." *Works*, p. 264.

It is altogether probable that the eunuch was reading the Septuagint Greek version instead of the Hebrew; for the Septuagint was originally made for the Alexandrian library, and it had become the common version not only in Egypt, through which

the eunuch must have passed on his way to Jerusalem, but it was the common version among the Jews themselves, and Christ and the apostles frequently quoted from it instead of the original Hebrew. The passage which the eunuch was reading, as it is recorded in Acts viii. 32, 33, "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter," &c., in the New Testament Greek, is so exact a quotation from the Septuagint Greek in this very passage, that we cannot doubt that Luke quoted it from the Septuagint, and in all probability this was the version the eunuch was reading when Philip overtook him.

Whichever version he read, it is certain that he did not read *sprinkle* many nations, but *astonish* or cause them to *exult* or *leap for joy*.

If the eunuch was only to be sprinkled, why should both he and Philip go down into the water?

Calvin, in his comment on this place, observes, "Here we perceive how baptism was administered among the ancients, for they immersed the whole body in water." *Pengilly*, p. 33.

Doddridge, in his Family Expositor, says, "*They both went down*," &c. "It would be very unnatural to suppose that they went down to the water merely that Philip might take up a little water *to pour* on the eunuch. A person of his dignity, no doubt, had many vessels in his baggage, on such a journey, through a desert country, a precaution absolutely necessary for travellers in those parts, and never omitted by them." *Ib.* p. 33.

Every unprejudiced reader, whether he reads the account of the eunuch's baptism in our common English version, or in the original Greek, will say, Here is an unmistakable example of baptism, in minute detail, and that baptism was an immersion.

What will the reader think of the *candor* or *truthfulness* of Dr. Rice's statement in his work on Baptism, p. 125, where he says, "This, let it be noted, is the only example of Christian baptism to which immersionists appeal, as favoring their views! Only think of it! but a solitary instance of Christian baptism in the New Testament to which immersionists appeal!"

No; Dr. Rice's statement is utterly incorrect Baptists appeal to *every* example of baptism in the New Testament as favoring their views. Of this he should be well aware. Paul says his baptism was a *burial*, and he says the baptism of the other Christians was a *burial*. "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism." He and all others who were *buried in baptism*. So the best commentators and scholars of every denomination have repeatedly testified. A cause which induces a man of such talents to resort to such assertions as that, must surely be sorely in need of *argument* to sustain it.

CHAPTER XXII.

BAPTISM OF PAUL, CORNELIUS, AND THE JAILOR.

Scripture account—Paul calls his baptism a burial—Paul not sick—Standing up—*Anastas* does not mean standing still—Plenty of water at Damascus for immersion—Rivers of Damascus—Dr. Hibbard—Baths common in the East—Dr. Cooke and Mr. Towne on Paul's baptism—Their guesses—Baptism of Cornelius—Who shall forbid water?—Dr. Hibbard's absurd notions—Much water at Cæsarea—Baptism of the jailor—Lydia—Jailor was *out of* the inner prison and out of the house when baptized—Plenty of water—Pedobaptist contradictions of the Scripture.

BAPTISM OF PAUL.

Acts xxii. 16. "And now why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Acts ix. 18, "And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales; and he received sight forthwith, and arose and was baptized."

Rom. vi. 4. "Therefore *we* are buried with him by baptism." Col. ii. 12, "Buried with him in baptism."

Paul himself plainly informs us that his own baptism was a *burial.* That this was the mode of baptism in the days of the apostles has been abundantly proved. The best commentators and critics agree in their testimony upon this point. Though

Paul himself says he was *buried* in baptism, yet some Pedobaptists think he was not immersed.

Some of them say he was too weak and sick to be immersed. But the Bible says not a word about his being sick. True, he was blind for three days, and he tells us the cause of the blindness. Acts xxii. 11, "I could not see for the glory of that light, being led by the hand of them that were with me, I came into Damascus." He was, then, able to go into Damascus, being led by the hand, not on account of weakness or sickness, but blindness. When Ananias came to him, not a word is said about healing him of any sickness, but he came to restore his sight. All this severe sickness of Paul is purely imaginary, so far as the Scripture record informs us. If it be said that the command to *arise* shows that he was sick, it would also show that *Ananias* was sick too, for in verse 11 God commands him to *arise* and go into the street called straight. Ver. 39. Then Peter *arose* and went with them. Was Peter sick?

Paul had fasted for three days, but this does not prove him incapable of being immersed. We conclude that he himself knew what his baptism was, and *he* says he was *buried* in baptism.

Yet, though Pedobaptists say Paul was so weak and sick, they will have him baptized *standing up*, not reclining on a bed, not sitting, nor even kneeling, but *standing up*. All this because it says, "He *arose* and was baptized." If the Bible had said he

was baptized without rising up, it would have been an argument against immersion. But the Bible says he did what was necessary for an immersion, but what was utterly unnecessary for either sprinkling or pouring—that is, he arose. So do all my candidates arise before they are immersed. They arise and go about the duty.

But if Paul was sprinkled, or poured, why did he not recline upon a couch, especially as he was so *sick* and weak? or, at least, why could he not sit or kneel? Why must he be baptized standing up? Doctors Rice, Peters, Hibbard and Fairchild would have us believe that *anastas*, he *arose*, not only means that he arose, but *continued standing still* all the time after he arose until he was baptized. Now, the Greek participle *anastas* implies no such idea as that. *Anastas* does not mean *standing still.* This verb *anisteemi*, from which *anastas* is derived, occurs more than a half dozen times in this same chapter which records the baptism of Paul, and its use here abundantly proves that it was a preparatory act to something which was to follow, but it by no means shows that the person was to stand still during the performance of the subsequent act. Now, Paul *arose* preparatory to his being baptized. But his baptism was a subsequent act after his arising, and *anastas* by no means implies that he was standing still, or standing at all, during the subsequent act. Acts ix. 6, "*Arise* and go into the city." Did that mean "go into the city" standing

still? 11, "*Arise, (anastas,)* and go into the street which is called straight." Did Ananias stand still while doing this? 18, "He *arose, (anastas,)* and was baptized." Does this prove that he was standing still when he was baptized? 34, "Eneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole; *arise*, and make thy bed." Was he to do it standing still? 39, "Peter *arose, (anastas,)* and went with them." *Standing still?* 40, "Tabitha, *arise.*" 41, "And he gave her his hand and *lifted her up*, and when he had called the saints and widows, presented her alive." Acts x. 13, "Arise, *(anastas,)* Peter, slay and eat." 20, "Arise, *(anastas,)* therefore, and get thee down."

With these examples before him, who can doubt that *arise* here merely denotes an act preparatory to his baptism, and does not indicate at all his posture during his baptism?

WAS THERE WATER FOR PAUL'S IMMERSION?

Paul was baptized at Damascus. 2 Kings, v. 12, "Are not Abana and Pharpar, *rivers of Damascus*, better than all the waters of Israel?" So the Bible tells us there were rivers at Damascus.

Dr. Hibbard. "It was such a climate that origi nated the demand for baths, and pools, and foun tains, *throughout the East*, and made the practice of bathing so common." Vol. ii. p. 152.

Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Article *Bathing.* "Bathing undoubtedly took place first in

rivers and in the sea; but men soon learned to enjoy this pleasure in their own houses. Rooms, both public and private, were built expressly for the purpose of bathing." See a lengthy and minute description of them in the above work.

HORNE'S INTRODUCTION TO THE BIBLE, vol. ii. p. 170. "We may, therefore, consider it probable that public baths, soon after the enactment of this law, [of Moses,] were erected in Palestine, of a construction similar to that of those which are so frequently seen at the present day in the East."

ORCHARD'S History, p. 17. "Agrippa built one hundred and sixty places for bathing, where the citizens might be accommodated either with hot water or cold, free of expense. The baths of Nero had salt water brought into them. Those of Caracalla were adorned with two hundred marble columns, and furnished with sixteen hundred seats of the same materials. Lipsius assures us the baths were sufficiently large for eighteen hundred persons to bathe at the same time. In modern Turkey, (which includes Damascus,) as well as among the ancients, bathing makes part of diet and luxury; so that in every town and every village there is a public bath."

Yet Dr. Cooke and Mr. Towne, two distinguished Pedobaptists, writing on baptism, say of Paul's baptism, "The immerser must *guess* that there was a river or bath near at hand; *guess* that a sick man rose from his couch, after eating and drinking

othing for three days, and yet was able to walk the distance to and fro, and the exposure of the immersion."

No, gentlemen. Baptists make no *guesses* about a supply of water at Damascus. The Bible tells us there were "rivers of Damascus," and all travellers and all history tell us of the *facts* of the abundant provisions for bathing in all those Eastern cities and villages. Let us notice some of your *guesses*.

You seem to have guessed there was no river at Damascus, though your Bible tells you there was. You guess there was no public or private bath there suitable for immersion, while travellers, historians, and biblical expositors tell us that all those Eastern cities were supplied with them. You guess that Paul was sick, and guess that he was so sick as to be on his couch, and you guess that if he was immersed he had to walk some "distance to and fro;" and you guess that his immersion would be an "exposure" to his health. You are admirably prepared to accuse immersionists of guessing and drawing conclusions from guesses.

I see not how any candid reader can peruse the account of Paul's baptism given in the New Testament and Paul's own description of it as a burial, without the clear conviction that Paul was immersed.

BAPTISM OF CORNELIUS.

Peter had been directed by God himself to go to Cæsarea to Cornelius, a Roman centurion. Peter

went in and found many that were come together. After preaching the gospel to them, and seeing them the recipients of miraculous gifts of the Spirit, speaking with tongues, he said: "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as me? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Acts x. 47, 48.

Cornelius was the first Gentile convert that was baptized—the first proselyte from paganism to Christianity. Previous to Peter's visit he "feared God," but now he received the gospel of Christ. Concerning proselytes,

JAHN'S Arcæhology says, "Their *immersion* was not only a symbol of their having been purified from the corruption of idolatry, but it signified, likewise, that, as *they had been buried in the water*, they now arose new men." Page 413.

Some advocates of sprinkling think he was baptized in his house. The Bible does not tell us where he was baptized. Dr. Hibbard thinks the words, "Can any man forbid water," &c., mean simply, "Will some one be kind enough to fetch some water, that these may be baptized?" He thinks Peter was asking if there was any one present who would do him so much of a favor as to bring some water. Is this the import of Peter's inquiry? No, indeed. "Can any man forbid water *that these should not be baptized* who have received the Holy Ghost as well as me?" Peter asked, "Can any man forbid their

baptism?" His mind was occupied with the question whether they should be *baptized*, not whether there was any one who would do himself so slight a personal favor as to bring a little water. No Gentile had yet been baptized. Peter at first hesitated even to go to the house of the centurion until specially directed of God. He knew that he would be called to an account by his Jewish brethren for his visit to Cornelius, a Gentile; and we learn in Acts xi. 2, 3 that "when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them." Peter was thinking of his own *duty* in reference to Cornelius, not of the politeness or favors his hearers were willing to show him.

How absurd to suppose Peter asking the question, "Shall any one forbid bringing a cup of water into Cornelius' house?" Peter had been sent for by Cornelius, and was his honored guest. Shall he now ask, Will any forbid bringing a cup of water? This cannot be his meaning; but he must have meant, "Shall they be baptized?" Yes, he "commanded them to be baptized." No doubt they were baptized as others were; that is, buried in baptism.

Cæsarea was situated on the shore of the Mediterranean Sea, and of course there was *much water* there. The Bourdeaux Pilgrim who visited Cæsarea, where Peter baptized Cornelius, about three hundred years after that event, records, "There is the

bath of Cornelius the Centurion, who did much alms." *Chase*, p. 119. So we find there was not only the sea, but a bath convenient for the baptism of Cornelius.

BAPTISM OF THE PHILIPPIAN JAILOR.

Paul and Silas preached at Philippi in Macedonia. Lydia and her household were the first converts They first heard the gospel from the lips of Paul, while they were "*by a river side*," Acts xvi. 13. She was baptized, and the river immediately at hand furnished the means for her immersion.

Soon after her conversion, Paul and Silas were arrested and cast into prison. The jailor thrust them into the inner prison, and put them in the stocks. At midnight the prison was shaken by an earthquake, the doors were opened, and their hands were loosed. The keeper, seeing the doors open, and supposing the prisoners had escaped, drew his sword to kill himself. Paul cried, "Do thyself no harm, for we are all here." The jailor then called for a light, and sprang in, and fell down before Paul and Silas, and *brought them out*, and said, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" And they said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. Acts xv.. 24–32. Verse 33, "And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his

straightway. 34. And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house."

Let us here notice some circumstances in this account of the jailor.

1. The jailor brought Paul and Silas *out of the* inner prison, verse 30.

2. Subsequently they spake the word of the Lord to all that were *in his house*, verse 32. This seems to indicate that they were in the house of the jailor, when Paul and Silas preached to them.

3. Then the jailor *took them* and washed their stripes, and was baptized, verse 33. That is, he took them *out of his house* when Paul had preached to them, for

4. After they were baptized, he *brought them into his house*, verse 34.

Now all this account is perfectly natural if their baptism was immersion; but their going out of the house was utterly unnecessary for sprinkling or pouring. Thus not only the meaning of the word *baptizo*, and the acknowledged practice of the primitive Christians, but the very items of the narrative indicate *immersion* as the act performed.

But where was there *water* for immersion? Pedobaptists seem to think no supply of water for immersion could be found. But the river Strymon was near at hand. And not only "the prison yards, but the yards and gardens of private houses in the

East are usually furnished with tanks of water." *Judson*, p. 15.

How rashly Pedobaptists make assertions on the baptism of the jailor! See the following:

Dr. Hibbard, Pt. ii. pp. 110, 111. "The baptism of the Philippian jailor was performed in his own house, in the jail." This flatly contradicts the Scripture, which says they were brought into the house after their baptism, verses 33, 34.

Dr. Cooke and Mr. Towne, p. 56. "It took place in the prison, where to suppose there was a bath or other convenience for immersion, were against all probability." The Bible does not say it took place *in the prison*. It may have been within the outer prison or prison yard, or it may have been at a river near by. Nor is it "against all probability" that there was water sufficient for immersion in the prison enclosure; but I have shown from the best of authorities, that such conveniences for bathing were common, not only to prisons, but to private families in the East.

Wesley insists that the jailor was baptized *in the prison*. Doctrinal Tracts, p. 245.

M'Leod, another Methodist, says, "All the parties were in the prison. We know that water *was brought* to wash the stripes of the apostles," p. 39. The Bible does not say water *was brought* to wash their stripes, but implies the contrary; verse 33, "He took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized." It does not

say "he *brought water* and washed their stripes;" yet Mr. M'Leod says, we know they did. What recklessness of assertion! Truth and righteousness do not require such efforts to sustain them.

Some insist that they could not have gone out of the prison for the baptism, for it would have been a breach of faith to the government which had imprisoned him. He refused to leave the prison the next day until the officers came and brought them out.

But what breach of faith could it be to go out, if he voluntarily came back, and remained in custody until the authorities brought him out?

Whether, therefore, the jailor and his household were baptized in a pool within the prison enclosure or in a river near by, his baptism was doubtless like Paul's—a *burial*, an *immersion*. Paul, who regarded baptism as a burial, doubtless either baptized the jailor, or witnessed it. He would not, therefore, depart from the command of God, and perform some different act, and call it baptism.

CHAPTER XXIII.

BAPTISM OF CUPS, POTS, BRAZEN VESSELS, TABLES—BAPTISM ON RETURNING FROM THE MARKET—DIVERS BAPTISMS.

Mark vii. 1–4, 8—Law of Moses required divers immersions—Rabbi Maimonides—Rabbi Salmon—Schneckenberger—Spencer—Vatablus—Grotius—Encyclop. Rel. Kn.—Dr. Meyer—Fritzsche—Olshausen—Buxtorf—Lightfoot—Rosenmuller—Wetstein—Kuinoel—Scaliger—Kitto—Immersion of beds—Calmet—Kitto—Jahn—Horne—Couches and tables easily immersed—Strange assertions of Pedobaptists.

MARK vii. 1–4. "Then came together unto him the Pharisees and certain of the Scribes which came from Jerusalem, and when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled, that is to say, with unwashed hands, they found fault. For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash (*ripto*) their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market, except they wash (*baptisontai*, middle voice, baptize themselves,) they eat not. And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the washing (*baptismous*) of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables."

Notice a few items in the foregoing account.

1. Mark records it as the custom of not only the Scribes and Pharisees, but of all the Jews, to wash their hands before eating, and calls it a tradition of the elders.

2. Mark says that besides this universal custom of washing their hands before they eat, they had another custom, that when they returned from the marke´ they not merely washed their hands, (*nipsontai,*) but they did more—they *immerse* (*baptisontai*) themselves.

3. Mark adds alsó that they were so thorough in their ceremonial purifications as to baptize, immerse, cups, pots, brazen vessels, and tables, or beds.

The law of Moses required divers immersions. Paul, in Heb. ix. 10, alludes to them, and calls them "divers baptisms," or immersions. The following quotations show that these divers baptisms were divers *immersions*:—

Leviticus, xi. 32. "And upon whatsoever any of them (unclean animals) doth fall, it shall be unclean, whether it be any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack, whatsoever vessel it be wherein any work is done, it *must be put into water,* and it shall be unclean until the even: so shall it be cleansed."

Lev. vi. 28. "If it be sodden in a *brazen pot,* it shall be both scoured and *rinsed in water.*"

Here we have explicit commands for these ceremonial immersions; and these punctilious Pharisees and Scribes, holding the traditions of the elders, were over-careful, and accused the disciples of Jesus

of neglecting proper attention to their purification.

Lev. xv. 5. "Whosoever toucheth his bed, shall wash his clothes and *bathe himself in water.*" The same expression, "bathe himself in water," is also found in verses 7, 8, and 10. Verse 12, "Vessels of wood shall be *rinsed in water.*" See also Lev. xvii. 15, Num. xxxi. 23, and Lev. xv. 21.

These things they were required to observe when they had *actually* contracted this ceremonial impurity. But they were *not required* by the law of Moses to perform the ceremonies when they had merely gone out into the crowd or into the market, where there was a liability of coming in contact with things or persons that were unclean. This was one thing which Moses had not enjoined. It was simply a tradition of the elders, and Jesus reproves them for it.

But the only question is, what is the meaning of the word *baptismos*, as it occurs in these passages. We have already shown that the law of Moses required "*divers immersions.*"

Let us hear the testimony of Jewish Rabbis themselves on this point.

Rabbi Maimonides. "Wherever in the law washing of the flesh or clothes is mentioned, it means *nothing else* than dipping of the whole body in a laver; for if a man dips himself all over except the tip of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness." "Every one that is baptized [as they were, on

coming from the market,] must *immerse the whole body.*" "In a laver which holds forty *seahs* [about one hundred gallons] of water, every defiled person dips himself, except a profluvious man; and in it they dip all unclean vessels. A bed that is wholly defiled, if he dip it part by part, is pure. If he dip the bed in the pool, although its feet are plunged in the thick clay at the bottom of the pool, it is clean. What shall he do with a pillow or bolster of skin? He must dip them and lift them out by the fringes." *Adkins*, p. 108.

Here is the explicit fact that they actually did immerse themselves, and also immersed beds which had contracted ceremonial defilement, and that they were scrupulously careful to have every part immersed.

RABBI SALMON, on Ex. xxix., says, "Not only the hands and feet were washed, but the *whole body.*" *Adkins*, p. 111.

Let us hear the testimony also of the following:

SCHNECKENBERGER, quoting the Jewish Talmud, says, "In proselyte baptism, the male, after circumcision, is led into the water, and completely immerses himself in the water. The female is led into the water up to the neck, and then immerses herself in the water." "The other ordinary lustrations of the Jews were performed in the same way." *Adkins*, p. 110.

SPENCER, on the Ritual Laws of the Hebrews, says, "Some of the Jews, ambitious for the credit

of superior purity, *frequently immersed their whole person in water.*" *Adkins*, p. 111.

STARCK, in his Hist. Bap. p. 8, says, "The baptisms with the Jews were not by sprinkling, but, in addition to washing the whole body, an *entire immersion.*" *Ut supra*, 161.

VATABLUS, Prof. of Hebrew in Paris. On Mark vii. 4. he says, "They *bathed themselves all over.*" *Ut supra*, 111.

GROTIUS. "They cleansed themselves more carefully from defilement contracted at the market, to wit, not only by washing their hands, but even by *immersing* their body." *Ut supra*, 111.

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE, p. 650. "The beds, clothes and moveables which had touched anything unclean, contracted also a kind of impurity, and in some cases communicated it to others. These legal pollutions were generally removed by bathing, and lasted no longer than the evening. The person polluted plunged over head in the water, and either had his clothes on when he did so, or washed himself and his clothes separately."

DR. H. A. W. MEYER, in his Manual on the Gospels of Mark and Luke, says, "The expression in Mark vii. 4 is not to be understood of the *washing of* the hands, (as interpreted by Lightfoot and Wetstein,) but of the *immersing*, which the word always means in the Classics and the New Testament; that is, here, according to the context, the taking of

a bath. So Luke xi. 38. Having come from the market, where, among a crowd of men, they might have come in contact with unclean persons, they eat not without having first bathed themselves. The representation proceeds after the manner of a climax; before eating, they *always* observe the washing of hands, but [employ] the *bath* when they come *from the market* and wish to take food." *Chase*, p. 95.

C. F. A. FRITSCHE, in his Commentary on Mark vii. 4, says, "And when they have come from the market, that is, from business in the market, they do not eat unless they have washed their body. Thus Beza and Grotius explain the passage most rightly." *Chase*, p. 94.

OLSHAUSEN, on this passage, says, "*Baptizesthai* differs from *Niptesthai*. The former is here the *immersing* and cleaning off of provisions that had been purchased, in order to remove every possible impurity which might have been on them." *Chase*, p. 94.

BUXTORF. "On the contrary, those who had departed from the house washed in a bath, or at least *immersed* their hands in water with the fingers distended." *R. Fuller*, p. 48.

LIGHTFOOT, WETSTEIN, ROSENMULLER and KUINOEL, though they think the washing had reference only to the hands, yet explicitly say the word *baptize* meant the *immersing* of their hands. *R. Fuller*, pp. 48, 49.

SCALIGER. "The more superstitious part of the Jews, every day, before they sat down to meat, *dipped the whole body.*" *R. Fuller*, p. 50.

KITTO'S Cyclopedia of Biblical Lit., Art. Ablution. "The hands were *plunged in water.*" It was this last, namely, the ceremonial ablution, which the Pharisees judged to be necessary. When, therefore, some of that sect remarked that our Lord's disciples ate 'with unwashen hands,' it is not to be understood literally that they did not at all wash their hands, but that they did not *plunge* them ceremonially according to their practice."

Some Pedobaptists have urged that the *tables* or couches (Greek *kline*) could not be immersed. It is to be borne in mind that the tables, and couches, and beds of the East were very different from ours.

CALMET. "The word *bed* is in many cases calculated to mislead and perplex the reader. The beds in the East are very different from those used in this part of the world." It is often nothing more than "a cotton quilt folded double." *Hague*, p. 132. It was evidently so light that it could easily be picked up and carried. Matt. ix. 6, "Then saith he to the sick of the palsy, Arise, take up thy bed and go into thy house." John v. 8, "Jesus saith unto him, [the infirm man at the Pool of Bethesda,] Arise, take up thy bed and walk."

KITTO'S Cyclopedia, Art. Beds. "The manner of sleeping in warm Eastern climates is necessarily very different from that which is followed in our

colder regions. Beds of feathers are altogether unknown, and the Orientals generally lie exceedingly hard. Poor people sleep on mats, or wrapped in their outer garment, which, from its importance in this respect, was forbidden to be retained in pledge over night. The more wealthy classes sleep on mattresses stuffed with wool or cotton, which are often no other than a quilt thickly padded."

There surely could be no difficulty in immersing those beds or couches. But allowing that the word *kline* means *table*, that also could be easily immersed.

JAHN'S Archæology, p. 156. "The *table* in the East is a *piece of round leather* spread upon the floor, upon which is placed a sort of stool. This supports nothing but the platter. The seat was the floor, spread with a mattress, carpet, or cushion, upon which those who ate sat with legs bent and crossed."

HORNE'S Introduction to the Bible, vol. ii. p. 172. "The ancient Hebrews at their meals had each his separate table. When Joseph entertained his brethren in Egypt, he seated each of them at his particular table, and he himself sat down separately from the Egyptians who ate with him; but he sent to his brethren out of the provisions which were before him. Gen. xliii. 31–33."

These tables could be as easily immersed as any ordinary garment, and when they had become ceremonially unclean, the scrupulous Jew would find no

difficulty in immersing them in water, nor would he be satisfied with *less* than their immersion, which the law of Moses required. Lev. xi. 32; xv. 5, 21, 27; xvii. 15.

How strangely Pedobaptists speak on this subject! Notice a few of them.

JOHN WESLEY. "As for tables and beds, no one will suppose they *could* be dipped." Doctrinal Tracts, p. 241. Did not Mr. Wesley know what an Eastern table or couch was? If so, he knew they could be easily immersed. Jewish writers themselves declare they were immersed, and the law of Moses required it. Yet Mr. Wesley thinks no one will suppose they could be immersed!

DR. FAIRCHILD, p. 22. "Can any one suppose that every Jew, in summer and winter, in conformity to tradition, was obliged to take these *heavy* articles of *furniture* to a pool or river, *quite distant from his dwelling*, perhaps, and plunge them under water? The idea is perfectly ridiculous." Yet not quite so sadly ridiculous as to see such an author giving such a representation. Those "*heavy* articles of furniture" which even a sick man but just restored was required to take up and carry, were either a piece of round leather, a mat, a cotton quilt, or even only an outer garment. Dr. Fairchild conveys the idea that this must be done at all seasons, summer and winter; and Dr. Hibbard thinks it was done not only every day, but every time they ate, (vol. ii. p 75,) whereas the Bible *does not say* they

baptized their table or couches every day, or even twice a year. It simply says they held to the "baptism of cups, pots, brazen vessels, and tables" or couches, and at *some* time it was practiced. But we have reason to suppose they practiced it only when they had become ceremonially unclean. That might occur once a month, or not once a year. But when it did occur, they *immersed* them.

Dr. Hibbard, vol. ii. pp. 74, 75. "Such beds they could conveniently carry: hence the command, 'Arise, take up thy bed and walk.' Now, with this definition of the term *bed*, we admit the abstract possibility of their being immersed. And as they used their beds to recline upon while taking their meals, it seems perfectly consonant with their other practices to suppose they lustrated them *always* before eating. But that they immersed them, no man *in his senses*, and with the facts already adduced before him, will assert."

Dr. Hibbard would have exhibited his own *perception* if he had noticed the fact that it is not declared that they baptized their couches before eating, nor even themselves, except on certain special occasions; that is, when they had come from the market.

Dr. Peters, p. 61 "And to suppose that the *beds* or couches were *immersed*, would be preposterous, especially if we consider the superstition of the Jews, which led them to practice *these purifications many times a day*. To have immersed their couches

so often, would have kept them constantly unfit for use."

Has Dr. Peters lost his "senses," that he did not see that it was their hands they washed (nipto, not baptizo) every time they eat, and not their tables or couches? They did not baptize themselves before eating except when they had come from the market, and not one word is said about the baptism of their tables or couches before eating. Yet Dr. Peters states it as a fixed fact, and their immersion would "keep them constantly unfit for use."

EDWIN HALL, p. 65. "And what does Mr. Carson bring to show that they always immersed their whole bodies as often as they come from the market? Nothing but the idle begging of the question concerning the word baptize. There is not a scrap of evidence in anything else in the wide world to show it."

Had Mr. Hall ever read those passages I have already quoted in Leviticus? Had he read Rabbi Maimonides, and Rabbi Salmon, upon the Jewish customs? Had he read Spencer, Grotius, Beza, Schneckenberger, Buxtorf, Scaliger, and Jahn, when he wrote that sentence? A little more of an acquaintance with the Jewish writers, and with the theologians of the "wide world," and with his own Bible, would have prevented him from writing that sentence, or mantled his cheek with a blush as he wrote it.

Why, in the name of religion and candor, I ask, why do Pedobaptists make such statements? Must we question their knowledge, or suspect their candor? Or must we not believe a strange infatuation impels them to resort to unworthy means to support an erroneous theory?

It seems to me there is not room for a reasonable doubt in the mind of a candid, intelligent, prayerful inquirer, that the words *baptism* and *baptized*, as found in the original of Mark vii. 4, 8, and in Luke xi. 38, signify *immersion* and *immerse*.

In Luke xi. 37, 38, when Jesus sat down to dine with a Pharisee, the Pharisee "marvelled that he (Jesus) had not first washed (baptized) before dinner." I have heard it stated that Jesus had not then come from the market, and hence that custom of bathing on return from market was not what was alluded to here, but that the ordinary washing of the hands was here called baptism. This is all refuted by reference to the 29th verse of the same chapter: "When the people had *gathered thick together*, he began to say," &c.

ROSENMULLER says, *market* means simply "any public place where there was a crowd." *Comp. Com.* on Mark, vii. 4.

The Pharisee therefore wondered not that Jesus did not wash his hands before eating, which all the Jews did, but that on returning from such a promiscuous crowd he did not immerse his whole per-

son before eating. Moreover, *nipto* is the word which would have been used to denote *washing hands*, yet that word is not used, but *baptizo*, which means immerse. The writer therefore wished to convey the idea of immersion, and employed the appropriate word.

CHAPTER XXIV.

ONE BAPTISM—SPIRIT, WATER, AND BLOOD—NOAH AND THE ARK.

One baptism — Paul's argument for unity — The three witnesses, the spirit, water, and blood — Silly exposition by Pedobaptists, who make them disagree rather than agree—The true meaning —Witness of the Spirit—Witness of the blood—Witness of the water — Powerful testimony — Noah and the ark — Macknight, Owen, Leighton.

ON BAPTISM.

In Eph. iv. 3–6, Paul is urging the Ephesians to unity and peace, whether they were Jews or Gentiles, "endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all."

When they were converted they all embraced the same Lord, the same faith, and they all professed their devotion to Christ in the same baptism. All had been baptized the same, and all had embraced the same Lord, same faith, and the same hope. If three or four modes of baptism had then prevailed, Paul's argument would not only have lost its force in urging them to unity, but it would have made

against the cause he was advocating. It would have taught diversity instead of unity. But as there was but one baptism then, and that a burial, he uses that one baptism as an argument for unity. One Lord, one faith, one baptism, is plain, simple, and forcible.

Pedobaptists sometimes make this refer to spiritual and not water baptism. If this could be proved to be the correct exposition of the passage, as I think it cannot, still it would not prove baptism to be anything but immersion; for we have clearly seen that the baptism of the Spirit denotes its overwhelming influence—an immersion—and not a few drops merely.

THE THREE WITNESSES—SPIRIT, WATER, AND BLOOD.

1 John v. 8. "There are three that bear witness in earth—the Spirit, the water, and the blood—and these three agree in one."

An advocate of sprinkling recently said, "The Spirit is poured, and the blood of Christ is sprinkled, and the water of baptism must be poured or sprinkled, to agree with the Spirit and blood."

Dr. Fairchild, p. 100, says, "The Spirit is poured out, the blood of Christ was shed; and, to complete the agreement, the water of baptism must be poured or shed on the subject."

Well, which must be done? Must it be poured, sprinkled, or shed? If poured, it would not agree with the blood, which was sprinkled. If sprinkled,

it would not agree with the Spirit, for that was poured. Pedobaptists make these three witnesses disagree,—one is poured, the other is sprinkled, and the other—is—what? sprinkled or poured? for it cannot agree with both the others!

But such an interpretation makes the passage mean nonsense. "Three bear witness in earth—the Spirit, the water, and the blood—and these three agree in sprinkling or pouring!!!" Yet they make them disagree.

But what does the passage mean? "There are three that bear witness in earth—the Spirit, and the water, and the blood—and these three agree in one," one object, *in bearing witness for Christ*, to his messiahship, his divinity, his authority, his atonement.

The Spirit witnessed for him at his baptism. The Spirit takes the things of Christ and shows them to men; opens their hearts, enlightens their minds, convinces them of the truth.

So does the blood which Christ shed. The cross, the blood of Christ as the price of our redemption, was the theme of the apostles. The cross, the blood testified everywhere for Christ. When men embraced the atonement, their sins were taken away. This was glorious testimony for Christ given by the blood.

The water agreed with the Spirit and the blood in witnessing for Christ. Those who were baptized were baptized into *his death*. "Therefore we are

buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." In our baptism we testify for Christ. We renounce the world, give up all to him. We are buried as dead to the world, and rise to live for Christ. The baptism points to his burial and resurrection. Thus the water agrees with the Spirit and the blood in bearing witness for Christ.

It bears powerful witness, too. How many sinners have been convicted in witnessing a baptism, an immersion! But who was ever convicted by seeing a baby sprinkled? Thousands now in glory were first convicted of their need of a Saviour and of the divine reality of religion, while standing by the water-side and seeing a baptism, an immersion. Thus the Spirit, the water, and the blood agree most gloriously in one united testimony for Christ.

Baptism has borne such powerful testimony that many a Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, and Congregationalist, standing upon the bank and witnessing it, has felt the testimony in his heart, manifested in his streaming tears, and has been led in like manner to follow in the footsteps of Jesus, and obey his command. The very first time I ever administered the ordinance, a member of a Pedobaptist church witnessed it, and it bore such testimony to her heart and conscience, that the next Sabbath she followed the Saviour in this ordinance. I have

also baptized a considerable number who were first awakened to their lost condition as sinners by seeing the ordinance of baptism administered.

NOAH AND THE ARK.

1 Peter iii. 20, 21. "The long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the Ark was a preparing; wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth now save us; (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

MACKNIGHT, on this passage, says, "The water of baptism is here called the antitype to the water of the flood, because the flood was a type or emblem of baptism in the three following particulars: 1. As by building the Ark and entering into it, Noah showed his strong faith in the promise of God concerning his preservation by the very water which was to destroy the antediluvians for their sins, so by giving ourselves to be buried in the water of baptism, we show a like faith in God's promise, that though we die and are buried, he will save us from death, the punishment of sin, by raising us from the dead at the last day. 2. As the preserving of Noah alive during the nine months he was in the flood, is an emblem of the preservation of the souls of believers while in the state of the dead, so the pre-

serving believers alive while *buried in the waters of baptism*, is a prefiguration of the same event. 3. As the water of the deluge destroyed the wicked antediluvians, but preserved Noah by bearing up the Ark in which he was shut up till the waters were assuaged, and he went out of it to live again upon the earth, so baptism may be said to destroy the wicked and to save the righteous, as it prefigures both these events: the death of the sinner it prefigures by *burying of the baptized persons in the water;* and the salvation of the righteous, by *raising the baptized person out of the water* to live a new life."

OWEN. "I deny not but there is a great analogy between salvation by the Ark and that by baptism, inasmuch as the one did *represent* and the other *doth exhibit* Christ himself." *Pengilly*, p. 50.

ARCHBISHOP LEIGHTON. *Works*, p. 277. "The *dipping into the waters*, representing our dying with Christ, and our return thence our rising with him. The last thing is the resemblance of baptism in these things, to the saving of Noah in the flood. And it holds in that we spoke of last: for he seemed rather to have *entered into a grave*, as dead, than into a safeguard of life, in going into the Ark; yet *being buried* there, he AROSE AGAIN, as it were, in *coming forth to begin a new world*."

The testimony of these three eminent Pedobaptist writers, presents the above passage with great clearness and force. I need add no argument of my own.

CHAPTER XXV.

ORIGIN OF POURING AND SPRINKLING AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR BAPTISM.

Pedobaptist testimonies—1. Knapp—2. Cyprian—3. Venema—4. Calvin—5. Stillingfleet—6. Edinburgh Encyclopedia—7. Monks of Cressy—8. Pope Stephen—9. Basnage—10. Encyclopedia Britannica—11. New American Encyclopedia—12. Prof. Stuart—13. Fritsche—14. Salmasius—15. Valesius—16. Baronius—17. Rheinwald—18. Neander—19. Weiner—20. Von Coln—21. Stroth's Eusebius—22. Geisler—23. Du Fresne—24. Dr. Wall—25. Bishop Smith—26. Grotius—27. Methodist Discipline—28. Terretinius—29. Storr—30. Matthies—31. Dr. Johnson—32. Lit. Ch. Eng.—33. Wetham—34. Formey—35. Dionysius—36. Hamelius—37. Bishop Burnett—38. Dr. Cheyne—39. Sir J. Floyer—40. Chamirnus—Six facts—Conclusion.

How came *pouring* and *sprinkling* to be practiced and called baptism?

The best Pedobaptist theologians, commentators, scholars, and historians shall answer. They would not be likely to testify against their own practice unless they were compelled to do so by undoubted facts.

Here is their testimony.

1. Dr. George C. Knapp, Professor of Theology at Halle from 1775 to 1825. His Theology is translated by Dr. Woods, of Andover, and is a standard

work. Vol. ii. pp. 516, 517, "*Immersion* is peculiarly agreeable to the institution of Christ, and to the practice of the Apostolic Church; and so even John baptized, and *immersion* remained common for a long time, except that in the third century, or perhaps earlier, baptism of the sick was performed by sprinkling, or affusion; still some would not acknowledge this to be baptism, and a controversy arose concerning it, so unheard of was it to baptize by simple affusion. Cyprian first defended baptism by sprinkling when necessity called for it; but cautiously and with much limitation. It would have been better to have adhered to the ancient practice, as even Luther and Calvin allowed."

Here Dr. Knapp tells us the origin of sprinkling and the reason of it. It was first defended by an African bishop, Cyprian, in the *third century*, and then only in cases of *necessity*, when they thought a person who died unbaptized would be *lost*. Yet Cyprian defended it *cautiously*, and with much *limitation*.

Why all this, if it had been practiced by Christ and the apostles? But what does Cyprian himself, its first defender, say of it?

2. Cyprian, Bp. of Carthage, Africa, A. D. 248–257. Reply to Magnus. "You ask, dear son, what I think of those who in sickness receive the sacred ordinance; whether, since they are not washed (loti) in the saving water, but have it poured on them, (perfusi,) they are to be esteemed right Chris-

tians? In the *saving sacraments, when necessity obliges*, and God *grants his indulgence, abridgments of divine things* (divina compendia) will confer the whole on believers." *R. Fuller*, p. 82; *Judson*, p. 27.

Thus Cyprian, the first defender of pouring, considered it an abridgment of the divine thing, immersion, and that it must be permitted only in cases of necessity, and even then it needed God's indulgence; a striking proof that he considered *immersion* as the only *scriptural* and *divinely appointed* baptism. Sprinkling is only a substitute for pouring, and pouring a substitute for immersion. Sprinkling is, therefore, only the substitute for a substitute.

3. VENEMA. Hist. Eccles. "It is without controversy that baptism in the primitive Church was administered by immersion into water, and not by sprinkling. The essential act of baptizing in the second century consisted, *not in sprinkling*, but in *immersion into water*. To the essential rite of baptism in the third century pertained *immersion*, and *not aspersion*, except in cases of necessity, and it was accounted a *half-perfect* baptism. Immersion, in the fourth century, was one of those acts that were considered as essential to baptism; nevertheless, aspersion was used in the last moments of life on such as were clinics." *R. Fuller*, p. 80. "Beveridge, on the fiftieth apostolic canon, asserts that the ceremony of sprinkling *began to be used* instead of immersion about the time of Pope Gregory, in the sixth century, but without producing any testimony

in favor of his assertion, and it is undoubtedly a mistake. Martene declares in his *Antiq.* Eccles. Rit. L. i. p. i. c. i. that in all the ritual books or pontifical manuscripts, ancient or modern, that he had seen, *immersion was required*, except by the Cenomanensian, and that of a modern date, in which pouring on the head is mentioned. In the Council of Ravenna, also, held in A. D. 1311, both immersion and pouring are left to the determination of the administrator, and the Council of Nismes, in the year 1284, *permitted* pouring, if a vessel could not be had; therefore only in cases of necessity." *Judson*, p. 29.

This confirms the above.

4. JOHN CALVIN. Comment on Acts viii. 38. "Here we perceive how baptism was administered among the ancients, for they immersed the whole body in water. Now it is the prevailing practice [at Geneva] for the minister only to sprinkle the body or the head." *Bliss' Letters*, p. 40. Also,

"Wherefore, from the beginning, the Church has freely allowed herself, beyond this substance, to have rites a little dissimilar; for some *immersed thrice*, but others only once." *Calvin, quoted by Dr. Rice*, p. 43.

Here Calvin declares immersion to be the primitive practice, and the only diversity was that some immersed thrice, others only once. Yet Calvin throws aside the apostolic and scriptural baptism, immersion, and substitutes sprinkling. Whence did

he derive his authority thus to change God's ordinances?

5. Bishop Stillingfleet. "Rites and customs *apostolical* are *altered*—as dipping in baptism." *Bliss*, pp. 41, 42.

6. Edinburgh Encyclopedia, edited by Sir David Brewster, Art. Baptism. "The first law for sprinkling was obtained in the following manner: Pope Stephen II. being driven from Rome by Astolphus, king of the Lombards, in 753, fled to Pepin, who, a short time before, had usurped the crown of France. While he remained there, the monks of Cressy, in Brittany, consulted him whether, in case of necessity, baptism performed by pouring water on the head of the infant would be lawful, and Stephen replied that it would. But, though the truth of this fact be allowed, which some Catholics deny, yet pouring or sprinkling was admitted *only* in cases of *necessity*. It was not till 1311 that the Legislature, in a council held at Ravenna, declared *immersion* to be *indifferent*. In this country, [Scotland,] however, sprinkling *was never* practiced in ordinary cases until after the Reformation; and in England, even in the reign of Edward VI., immersion was commonly observed. But, during the persecution of Mary, many persons, most of whom were Scotchmen, fled from England to Geneva, and there gradually imbibed the opinions of that Church. In 1556 a book was published at that place, containing the form of prayers and ministration of the sacraments,

approved by the famous and godly, learned man, John Calvin, in which the administrator is enjoined to take water in his hand, and lay it on the child's forehead. These Scottish exiles, who had renounced the authority of the Pope, implicitly acknowledged the authority of Calvin; and, returning to their own country, with John Knox at their head, in 1559, *established sprinkling in Scotland.* From Scotland this practice *made its way into England* in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized by the established Church." *Theodosia*, vol. i. p. 125.

7. Monks of Cressy, A. D, 754, asked Pope Stephen II., "Is it lawful, in case of *necessity* occasioned by sickness, to baptize an infant by pouring water on its head, from a cup, or the hands?" Apud Concilia, Tom. vi. 1650. *R. Fuller*, p. 82.

8. Pope Stephen, in reply, said, "Such a baptism, performed in such a case of necessity, shall be accounted valid." *Ibid.*

9. Basnage. "This [the response of Stephen to the monks of Cressy] is accounted the *first* law against *immersion.* The pontiff, however, did not dispense with immersion, except in cases of extreme necessity. This law therefore did not change the mode of *dipping* in *public baptisms*, and it was not until 557 years after, that the legislature in a council at Ravenna, in the year 1311, declared immersion and pouring indifferent. *Ibid.* p. 83.

10. Encyclopedia Britannica, Art. Baptism. "The custom of sprinkling children, instead of dip-

ping them in the font, which was at first allowed in case of the weakness or sickness of the infant, has so far prevailed that immersion is at length quite excluded. What principally tends to confirm the practice of affusion or sprinkling, was, that several of our Protestant divines, flying into Germany and Switzerland, during the bloody reign of Queen Mary, and returning home when Queen Elizabeth came to the crown, brought back with them a great zeal for the Protestant churches beyond the sea, where they had been sheltered and received; and having observed that at Geneva and some other places, baptism was administered by sprinkling, they thought they could not do the Church of England a greater piece of service than by introducing a practice *dictated* by so great an oracle as Calvin." *Haynes' Bap. Cyclopedia*, pp. 288, 289.

11. New American Encyclopedia, Art. Baptism. "The form of baptism, at first, was, according to most historians, by immersion; but as Christianity advanced into colder climates, the more convenient mode of sprinkling was introduced." *Evert's Law of Bap.* p. 33.

Same work, Art. Baptists. "Many who are not Baptists, believe the immersion of adults was the primitive baptism of the New Testament. The fact is generally admitted in works of *scientific authority, both historical and archæological.*" *Ibid.*

12. Prof. Moses Stuart, p. 112. "All this serves to illustrate how there *sprung up*, in the bosom of

a church superstitiously devoted to ancient rites and forms, a conviction that the mode of baptism was one of the *adiaphora* of religion, *i. e.* something unessential to the rite itself, and which might be modified by time and place without any encroachment upon the command itself to baptize. *Gradually* did this conviction *increase*, until the whole Roman Catholic Church, that of Milan only excepted, admitted it. By far the greater part of the Protestant world have also *acceded* to the same views."

This is a striking declaration from Prof. Stuart. He tells us the idea that the *mode* was not essential to the ordinance, *sprung up* amid a superstitious church, *gradually increased* until all the Catholics, except those at Milan, admitted it, and finally Protestants have *acceded* to it. Yes, they have acceded to it, as Prof. Stuart did, at the same time knowing that it is not an apostolic idea, but the offspring of Romish superstition, gradually introduced. Let it be abandoned as a Romish superstition, and the original Bible baptism practiced in its stead.

13. J. H. Fritsche, Bib. Theology, 1820, vol. iii. p. 501. "With infant baptism, *still another change* in the outward form of baptism was introduced, that of *sprinkling* with water, instead of the former practice of *immersion*." *R. Fuller*, p. 81.

14. Salmasius. "The ancients did not baptize otherwise than by immersion, either once or thrice, except *clinics, or persons confined to their beds*,

who were baptized in a manner of which they were capable; not in the entire laver, as those who plunge the head under water, *but the whole body had water poured upon it.* Thus Novatian when sick received baptism, being *sprinkled, not baptized.*" *R. Fuller,* p. 80.

15. VALESIUS. "Rufinus rightly translates this *perfusum,* (poured about.) For those who were sick were baptized in bed, since they could not be immersed by the priest, they were only poured (perfundibantur) with water. Therefore baptism of this kind was not *customary,* and was esteemed imperfect, as being what appeared to be received by a man laboring under delirium, not willingly, but from fear of death. In addition, since baptism properly signifies *immersion,* a pouring of this sort could hardly be called a baptism. Wherefore *clinics* (for thus were they called who received baptism of this sort) were forbidden to be promoted to the rank of the presbytery, by the twelfth canon of the council of Neo-Cæsarea." *R. Fuller,* p. 82.

16. BARONIUS. "Those who were baptized upon their beds were not called *Christians,* but *clinics.*" Annales. Eccl. *Ib.*

17. RHEINWALD'S Christian Archæology, p. 302 "Baptism was administered by immersion; only in cases of necessity by sprinkling." *Adkins,* p. 142.

18. NEANDER'S Ch. Hist. vol. i. p. 310. "It was only with the sick, where exigency required it, that any exception was made," (in regard to immersion.)

19. Weiner, in his Lectures on Archæology in Manuscript. "Affusion was at first applied only to the sick, but was gradually introduced for others after the *seventh century*, and in the thirteenth became the prevailing practice in the West, (Catholic Church.) But the Eastern Church (Greek) has retained immersion alone as valid." *R. Fuller*, p. 83.

20. Von Coln. "Only with the sick was baptism administered by aspersion." *Ib.*

21. Stroth's Eusebius, vol. i. p. 506. "Baptism was administered to those on beds of sickness by sprinkling and pouring; in other cases it was at that time by immersion." *Ib.*

22. Geiseler's Ch. Hist. Ger. Ed. vol. ii. p. 274. "For the sake of the sick, *the rite of sprinkling was introduced.*" *Ib.*

23. Du Fresne's Latin Glossary, on the word Clinici. "From the custom of baptizing by pouring or sprinkling the sick who could not be immersed, (which properly is baptism,) was *introduced* the custom which now prevails in the Western Church." *Ib.*

24. Dr. Wall, author of Hist. of Infant Bap., and Vicar of Shoreham, England, in his Hist. of John the Baptist, Part 2, chap. ix. says, "France seems to have been the *first* country where baptism by affusion was used ordinarily to persons in health, and in the *public* way of administering it. It being allowed to weak children, (in the reign of Queen Elizabeth,) to be baptized by aspersion, many fond

ladies and gentlewomen *first*, and then by degrees the common people, would obtain the favor of the priest to have their children *pass* for weakly children, too tender to endure dipping in the water. As for *sprinkling* properly so called, it was at 1645 *just then beginning*, and used by very few. It must have begun in the disorderly times after forty-one, (1641.) They (the Assembly of Divines in Westminster) reformed the font into a basin. This learned Assembly could not remember that fonts to baptize in had always been used by the primitive churches, long before the beginning of Popery, and ever since churches were built; but that sprinkling for the purpose of baptizing was really introduced (in France first, and then in other popish countries) in times of Popery; and that, accordingly, *in all those countries in which the usurped power of the Pope is, or has formerly been owned, have left off dipping of* children in the fonts; but that *all other countries in the world which have never regarded his authority do still use it*, and that basins, (to sprinkle out of,) except in cases of necessity, were never used by Papists, or any other Christians whatsoever, till by themselves." *Judson*, 30, 31.

"The way that is ordinarily used, *we cannot deny to have been a novelty*, brought into this Church (English) by those that had learned it in Germany, or at Geneva. And they, not contented to follow the example of pouring a quantity of water, (which had then been introduced instead of immersion,) but

improved it (if I may so abuse that word) from pouring into sprinkling, *that it might have as little resemblance to the ancient way of baptizing as possible.*" *Judson*, p. 31.

25. Bishop Smith, of Kentucky. "Immersion was not only universal six or eight hundred years ago, but it was *primitive* and *apostolic*, no case of baptism standing on record by any other mode, for the first three hundred years, except the few cases of those baptized clinically, *i. e.* lying in bed. The bowl and sprinkling are strictly Genevan in their origin, *i. e.* were introduced by Calvin at Geneva." *Bliss' Letters*, p. 24.

26. Grotius. "The ordinance *has been changed* from immersion to sprinkling." *Bliss' Let.* p. 27.

27. Methodist Discipline. Twenty-second Article of Religion. "Every particular church may *ordain, change*, or *abolish* rites and ceremonies, so that all things be done to edification."

28. Turretinus. "Plunging *was changed* into sprinkling." *Westlake's Gen. View*, ch. 6.

29. Dr. Storr's Bib. Theol. vol. ii. bk. 4, § 109, Illust. 4. "*The change* of the ancient custom of immersion ought not to have been made."

30. Mattheis. "That this rite *has been changed* is indeed to be lamented; for it placed before the eyes, most aptly, the symbolical meaning of baptism." *Dr. I. Chase on Bap.* p. 51.

31. Dr. Samuel Johnson, in speaking of the popish practice of withholding the cup from the

laity, says, "I think they are as well warranted to make this alteration in that ordinance as we are to *substitute sprinkling* in the room of the *ancient baptism.*" *Bliss' Let.* p. 42.

32. First Liturgy of the Church of England, 1547, "Unless the child be sickly, the child is to be dipped in the water, so it be discreetly and warily done." *Ib.* 39.

33. Dr. R. Wetham's Annot. on Matt. iii. 6, "Not only the Catholic Church, but also the *pretended* reformed Churches, have *altered this primitive custom*, and now allow of baptism by pouring or sprinkling water on the person baptized. Nay, many of their ministers do it now-a-days by filliping a wet finger and thumb over a child's head, or shaking a wet finger or two over the child; which is hard enough to call baptism in any sense." *Ib.* pp. 38, 39.

34. Formey, a Prussian writer, 1711–1799, in his Eccl. Hist. towards the close of the second century. "Putting off their clothes, they were dipped three times; but when they administered baptism to *clinics*, that is, to those who were confined to their beds from illness, they made use of simple sprinkling." *Haynes' Bap. Cyclopedia*, p. 270.

35. Dionysius Petavius. "Immersion is properly styled baptism, though at present we content ourselves with pouring water on the head, which in Greek is called *perichusis*, i. e. *perichisen*, if I may so Anglicise; but *not baptism.*" *Bliss*, p. 27.

36. HAMELIUS. "Whereas the sick, by reason of their illness, could not be immersed or plunged, (which, properly speaking, is to be baptized,) they had the salutary water poured upon them, or were sprinkled with it." *Westlake*, ch. 6.

37. BISHOP BURNETT. "The danger of dipping in cold climates may be a very good reason for *changing* the form of baptism to *sprinkling*." *Ib.*

38. DR. CHEYNE. "I cannot sufficiently admire [wonder] how cold bathing should ever have come into such disuse, especially among Christians, when commanded by the greatest lawgiver that ever was." *Bliss*, p. 42.

39. SIR JOHN FLOYER, in an address to the high officers of the Episcopal Church, in Litchfield, Eng. "Immersion continued in the Church of England until about the year 1600. And from hence I infer that if God and the Church thought the practice innocent for sixteen hundred years, it must be considered an unreasonable nicety, in the present age, to scruple either immersion or cold bathing as dangerous practices." *Ib.* p. 138.

"Sprinkling was *brought into* the Church by the Popish Schoolmen, and the English Dissenters adopted it from them." *Gill's Part and Pillar of Popery*, p. 43.

40. CHAMIERIUS' Catholica Panstratia, L. v. ch. 3. "Immersion of the whole body was used from the beginning, which expresseth the force of the word baptize; whence John baptized in a river. It was

afterwards *changed* into sprinkling, though it is uncertain when or by whom it commenced." *Haynes Cycloped.* p. 145.

Here is the the testimony of *forty* of the most eminent Pedobaptists, upon the *origin of pouring and sprinkling*, and the *change* of the ordinance. For convenience of reference, I have numbered them.

The testimony of Pedobaptists themselves abundantly establish the following facts:—

1. Immersion, and that only, was the primitive and apostolic baptism; and no other was established or sanctioned by Divine authority. For proof see in the foregoing witnesses, numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 14, 15, 24, 35, 38, 39, 40.

2. Pedobaptists say that men have changed the ordinance from immersion to pouring and sprinkling, and that, too, without any authority or sanction from God. Hence sprinkling is an institution of man, and not the ordinance of God. See numbers 1, 4, 5, 12, 13, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 40.

3. Pouring was first permitted by the African Bishop, Cyprian, A. D. 253, as a substitute for immersion in cases of the sick, or clinics; but was regarded as an abridgment of the divine institution (immersion) by those who introduced it. They ventured to use this abridgment only in cases of necessity, and even then they thought it needed God's indulgence. See numbers 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 35.

4. Sprinkling was subsequently adopted, and pouring and sprinkling were only used for the sick for a long time after they were introduced. See numbers 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 36, 37.

5. Pouring and sprinkling came into practice very *slowly*, and were not in common use equally with immersion until the Council of Ravenna, A. D. 1311. See numbers 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 24. After the decision of the Council of Ravenna, immersion still continued to be the almost universal practice in a large part of Europe, and especially in England and Scotland.

6. Sprinkling was first introduced into Scotland in 1559, and was subsequently introduced into England. See numbers 6, 10, 24, 39.

It is plain that this change of the ordinance, or, rather, this *departure of men* FROM *the ordinance*, is wholly unauthorized of God. It is disobedience to his command. It teaches for doctrines the commandments of men. It makes the command of God of none effect by human traditions. It cannot be harmless or innocent thus to disobey the positive commands of our Saviour.

Matt. v. 19. "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."

John xiv. 21, "He that hath my commandments

and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him and will manifest myself unto him."

John xiv. 15, "If ye love me, keep my commandments."

John xv. 14, "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you."

1 John ii. 3, "Hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments."

Let your love to Jesus prompt your obedience, and as you love him and his holy cause, do not consent to set aside his holy ordinance of baptism, and substitute therefor the commandments of men.

If you love the Saviour, and have not yet obeyed his command by being baptized, then why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized.

CHAPTER XXVI.

RECAPITULATION—REASONS FOR PRACTICING IMMERSION ONLY.

1. Meaning of the word baptize—2. All acknowledge immersion valid—3. Greek Lexicons sustain our view—4. Jesus commanded us to *immerse*—5. Classics require immersion—6. New Testament requires immersion—7. First gospel churches immersed—8. Translations of the Bible sustain immersion—9. Baptize cannot mean pour, sprinkle, or purify—10. Greek Church always immerses—11. Pedobaptists testify that immersion is the meaning of the word and the practice of primitive churches—12. Saviour's baptism proves that immersion is commanded—13. Immersion only expresses the figurative meaning—14. Immersion agrees with all the circumstances of baptism—15. Pedobaptists contradict the Bible—16. Immersion witnesses for Christ—17. Pedobaptists say they have changed the ordinance—18. Immersion satisfies the conscience of all.

I.

Because this is the meaning which the plain ordinary reader would get from the descriptions and accounts of baptisms as they are given in the Bible. Illustrated in chapters XII., XIV., XV., XVI., XXI.

II.

Because all religious denominations acknowledge the validity of immersion. None require a person to be sprinkled or poured after he has been immersed.

They do *not* all acknowledge the validity of *any other* mode. We can all unite upon the practice of immersion as being valid baptism. If all would practice what all acknowledge to be valid baptism, then the world would be in harmony and union at least on this subject, and our jarrings cease. The fault of separation does not lie at the door of Baptists, for they invariably practice the only mode of baptism which all denominations of Christians acknowledge to be valid. Chapters II., XIII., XVI., XXV.

III.

Because the Greek Lexicons, with singular unanimity, declare that the meaning of the word *baptize* is to *immerse*, and not one of the thirty-two which are quoted in Chapter V. says it means to pour or sprinkle: the only one which ever gave *pour* as a definition of *baptizo* having expunged it as untrue.

This testimony is fully corroborated by sixteen other learned Lexicons and Encyclopedias, and by scores of other learned authorities from various denominations, ages, and countries. Chapters V., VI., X., XI., XIII., XVI., XXV.

IV.

The command of our Saviour to *baptize* was a command to *immerse;* for that is the meaning of the word, as is proved by the most eminent Pedo-

baptists themselves, and by all the Greek Lexicons and other authorities. Our Saviour did not mean *sprinkle, pour, purify,* or *consecrate,* when he said baptize, else he would have used the appropriate word to express his meaning. But as he used the word *baptize,* he commanded the act which that word denotes, namely, *immersion.* Chapters V., VII., VIII., IX., X., XI., XII., XIII.

V.

Because all the classical Greek writers, and all the early Christian writers used the word *baptize* to mean *dip, immerse, submerge,* and never *to sprinkle* or *to pour.* They certainly understood the meaning of the word, and the apostles and early Christians surely knew what was the act which the Saviour commanded. They understood that act to be immersion. Chapters VI., VII., VIII., IX., X., XI.

VI.

Because the most eminent Pedobaptist scholars, theologians and commentators, themselves testify that *immersion* is the meaning of the word *baptize,* not only in the classics, but in the New Testament. *Immersion* is then the duty which our Saviour commanded us to perform. Chapters VIII., XIII., XVI.

VII.

Because *immersion* was the practice of all the first Gospel Churches, and continued to be the com-

mon practice for *thirteen hundred years;* and God has never authorized a change from immersion to pouring and sprinkling. Chapters VIII., XIII., XVI.

VIII.

Because every one of the fourteen translations of the Bible, made into the various languages during the first eight hundred years after Christ, either gives the word baptize itself, or translates it by a word which means to *immerse*, and never to sprinkle or to pour. This shows how the first Christians understood the ordinance. Chapter XI.

IX.

Because it is clearly demonstrated that *baptizo* cannot mean to sprinkle, pour, or purify. Such a sense cannot be attached to it either in the classics or Scripture, without the most glaring absurdity; whereas the idea of *immersion* agrees with its use in both the classics and in the Holy Scriptures. Immersion is therefore the duty which Christ commanded. Chapter XII.

X.

Because the Greeks, who surely can understand their own language, uniformly say that *baptize* means to immerse, and never to sprinkle or pour. And the Greek Church has always practiced immersion, and do so to this day. Chapters III., XIII., XVI.

XI.

Because the best scholars and theologians of modern times, belonging to various denominations, have fully admitted that *immersion* is the proper meaning of the word, and was the practice of the primitive Churches, even when this acknowledgment conflicted with their own practice. Chapters XIII., XVI., XXV.

XII.

Because our Saviour's own baptism in the river Jordan is his own practical exposition of the meaning of the word baptize. We learn what the *act* of baptism was, by witnessing what he *did*. He meant by *baptism* something which required him to go *into the water*. Nothing but *immersion* made it necessary for him to go into the river. *Immersion* is therefore what he meant by *baptism*. Chapter XV.

XIII.

Because *immersion*, and that only, expresses the figurative meaning of the ordinance; as being a burial, the baptism of suffering, overwhelming with sorrow; and the baptism of the Spirit, denoting its all-surrounding and all-pervading influence; and the baptism of fire, denoting the destruction of the wicked in hell. Chapters XVI., XVII., XVIII., XXIV.

XIV.

Because immersion is in perfect harmony with all the circumstances mentioned in the Bible in connection with baptism, while sprinkling and pouring are not at all in harmony with the circumstances, but directly in conflict with them. Chapters VIII., XII., XIV., XV., XVI., XVII., XVIII., XIX., XX., XXI., XXII., XXIII., XXIV.

XV.

Because Pedobaptists, in sustaining their theory, are obliged repeatedly to contradict the plain declarations of the Bible. Chapters XIV., XV., XVII., XVIII., XIX., XX., XXI., XXII., XXIII., XXIV.

XVI.

Because immersion bears powerful witness to the great truths of the gospel, and has led many sinners who have witnessed it to think of their souls, and seek the Lord, while sprinkling and pouring have not done so. Chapter XXIV.

XVII.

Because Pedobaptists say that men have changed the ordinance from immersion into pouring and sprinkling. They declare they have a right to change it, which I deny. In attempting to change the ordinance, they have departed from the ordi-

nance of God, immersion, and substituted therefor a commandment of men, pouring and sprinkling. Chapter XXV.

XVIII.

Because immersion satisfies the conscience of every one who receives it, as to its validity, while thousands upon thousands of those who have been sprinkled or poured, either live with troubled consciences all their lives, or have to come out and be immersed in order to satisfy their consciences, and comply with the plain teaching of God's word. Chapter II., III.

THE END.

GENERAL INDEX.

Abridgment of *divine things*. Cyprian, 22, 50.
Absurdity of the advocates of sprinkling, 87, 88, 168, 171, 187, 201, 227.
Dr. Beecher's purifying theory, 137, 140.
Accusations against the Baptists, unjust, 9–11.
All can unite in practicing immersion, 14-17.
All denominations acknowledge the validity of immersion, 14
Amad, the Syriac word for baptize, means *immerse*, 125–127.
Amphibious, applied to our Saviour by McLeod, 168.
Ark, Noah, 303.
Baptism a duty commanded, 7, 8.
Extreme views on, 9, 10.
Not a saving ordinance, 9.
What is gospel baptism, 12.
Not a question of mere modes and forms, 12.
Is immersion only—one hundred witnesses. See *baptizo*, 36–60.
Classical use of *baptizo*, 61–78.
Of the blister-plaster, 73.
Cleansing from the pollution of a dead body, 100.
Does not mean moistening or wetting, 75, 76.
Nebuchadnezzar not said to be baptized with dew, as Pedobaptists assert, nor the lake baptized with blood, 77, 78.

Baptism of Naaman, 86–88.
Of Judith, 88–100.
In the primitive churches was immersion, 20, 21 24, 36–60, 104–120.
Of tears and of blood, 111, 114.
Of the altar on Mount Carmel, 115, 116.
Of John under the gospel dispensation, 159.
Of John was immersion, 166.
Of Jesus was immersion, 186–197.
Of Jesus was an example, 189.
Of Jesus expresses his meaning of the word baptizo, 189.
Of Jesus not to consecrate him as a Jewish priest, 191–194.
A burial, eighty-six witnesses, 198–219.
Of the Spirit, immersion, 220–235.
In fire, 223, 228–230.
Of suffering, 231–235.
Of the Israelites unto Moses, 236–243.
At Pentecost, 244–259.
Of the eunuch, 260–273.
Of the eunuch, change of raiment, 265–267.
Of the eunuch, water for, 267–269.
Of Paul, 274.
Of Cornelius, 279.
Of the jailor, 282.
Of cups, tables, &c., and on returning from market, 286–298.
One baptism, 299.
A witness for Christ, 300–302.
Baptizo, Its meaning given by thirty-two Greek Lexicons, all of which define it *immerse*, *dip*, or *plunge*, none *sprinkle* or *pour*, 36–44.
Defined by sixteen other Lexicons and Encyclopedias, 45–49.

Baptizo defined by fifty-three other Pedobaptist authorities, making one hundred of the most learned Pedobaptist witnesses in the world, 49–60.

MEANS NOTHING BUT IMMERSION, Anthon, 33. Bretschneider, 38. Mintert, 43. Kitto and Alstidius, 46. Beza, 49. Altingius, Hospinianus, 50. Gurtlerus, Buddeus, and Venema, Porson, Keckermannus, 51. Stourdza, and Rogers, Jer. Taylor, Geo. Campbell, 52. Storr and Flatt, and Lon. Quart. Review, Curcellius, 53. Knapp, 54. Salmasius and Augusti, 56. Sir John Floyer, 57.

CLASSICAL USE OF, always immerse, never to sprinkle or pour, 61–78.

Neither *bapto* nor *baptizo* ever mean to *sprinkle* or *pour*, in the classics, 64–69.

Classical use of *bapto*, 62–65.

Classical example of *baptizo*, 65–71.

Dr. Rice's classical references all teach immersion, and not one teaches sprinkling or pouring, 71–78. Ships baptized, 71. Sea-weed, 72. Blister-plaster, 73. Ashes, 74. Sword baptized, 75. Roman general's hand, 75. Lake not *baptized* in blood, 77.

Dr. Conant on the classical use of baptizo; gives every example from the classics, 69.

SACRED SENSE OF, always immerse, 79–84.

Pedobaptist argument refuted, 79–84.

USE OF, IN THE SEPTUAGINT, always immerse, 85–103.

USE OF, BY JOSEPHUS AND THE EARLIEST CHRISTIAN WRITERS, 104–120.

Cannot mean *sprinkle* or *pour*, 132–134.

Cannot mean *purify*. Dr. Beecher, 137–140.

Baptists, accused of making too much of baptism, 9.

Do not regard baptism a saving ordinance, 9.

Unjustly accused by Dr. Fairchild, 10.

Baptists require regeneration previous to baptism, 10.
Teach salvation by grace and justification by faith, 11.
Preach on baptism less than Pedobaptists, 11.
Their views stated, 14.
Increasing in America, 27.
Many in other denominations, 27.
Two millions of immersed church-members now in America, 28.
Their views of other denominations and ministers, 29, 30.
Reproached as unlearned, yet the *learned* Pedobaptists testify that we are right, 49, 135.
In the South. Dr. W—— and the negro, 135.
Persecuted, 27, 136,
Bigotry, 16.
By-roads, 15–17.
California emigrants, 15–17.
Changes of raiment at Pentecost, 256.
Changes of raiment, eunuch, 265–267.
Classical use of *baptizo*. See *baptizo*.
Cleanse. Webster's definition, 34.
Clinics not called Christians, 24.
Clinics forbidden to be presbyters, 23.
Conant on the classical use of *baptizo*, 69.
Consume, a generic definition of a specific word, *eat*, 33.
Contradiction of Scripture by Pedobaptists. See *Pedobaptists*.
Cornelius, baptizing of, 279.
Council of Neo-Cæsarea prohibited clinics from being presbyters, 24.
Dead body, baptism to cleanse from pollution of, 74, 100.
Decency, comfort, and health required frequent immersions in Palestine. Dr. Hibbard's testimony, 98.
Horne's Introduction says it was among the principal recreations of Eastern ladies, 98.

Decency of Judith s immersion, 91, 95–100,
Divers baptisms, 236, 287.
Duty of baptism, 7.
Eat, used as an illustration of *baptizo*, 33.
Emigrants starting for California, 15.
Enon located on the Jordan, 174.
Ethiopian eunuch baptized, 260–273.
Example furnished in Christ's baptism, 189.
Extremes should be avoided, 9, 10.
Fault of separation not chargeable to Baptists, 15.
Frogs and mice, battle of, 77.
Garments, changes of, 256, 265–268.
General argument of Dr. Rice, numbers, 18.
German translation of the Bible, 126.
Greek Church always practice immersion, 25.
Greek Church, extent of it, 25.
Greek Lexicons, thirty-two quoted, 36–44.
Greek Lexicons define *baptizo immerse*, none to sprinkle or pour, 36–44.
Their testimony against Dr. Rice's position, 39.
Guesses of Drs. Cooke and Towne, 190, 191, 278, 279.
Historical evidence. Sixty-three Pedobaptist witnesses, 141–158.
Immersing only part of the candidate, 184.
Immersion a common practice for decency, comfort, and health, 98–100.
Of Jesus, 186–197.
The practice of the apostles and primitive Christians, Mosheim, 19. Venema, 21. Stuart, 24, 119. One hundred Pedobaptist witnesses, 36–60. Barnabas, Hermas, Philo, and Justin Martyr, 106. Tertullian, 107. Clement Alex. Hippolytus, 108. Cyprian, 109. Cornelius, Athanasius, 110. Jerome, Ambrose, 111. Gregory

of Neo-Cæsarea, Gregory Nazianzus, 112. Cyril of Jerusalem, 113. Basil, 114. Heliodorus, Chrysostom, 117. Cyril of Alexandria, Augustine, Apostolical Constitutions, 119. Stuart, 119. Sixty-three Pedobaptist witnesses quoted, 141–158. Others, 305–321.

Immersion the practice of the Greek Church, 25.
Required for proselytes, 93.

Immersions required by the law of Moses, 92–94, 294.

Jerusalem well supplied with water, 246–250.

Jesus immersed, 186–198.
His baptism an example, 189.

John's baptism under the gospel dispensation, 159–164.
Mode of, 166.
And rebaptism at Ephesus, 165.

John a prophet, and yet a gospel minister, 162.
May have baptized in the name of the Trinity, 163.

Judith immersed, 88–103. In the night, 88–89. Dr. Fairchild's misrepresentations of, 90, 91. Dr. Rice's evidences against Judith's immersion, 91. Hibbard says her immersion was not enough, 97.

Lake not *baptized* with blood. *Baptize* not in the passage, 77.

Law of Moses required immersions, 92–94, 288. Maimonides, 93. Witsius, 93. Lightfoot, 94.

Lexicons, Greek, thirty-two quoted, 36–44.
Liddell and Scott expunged *pour* as a definition of *baptizo*, 41.
Syriac, 45, 46.
Other Lexicons and Encyclopedias, 45–49.

Majority of Christians have been immersed, 18–30.

Methodist preacher's trials in becoming a Baptist, 28.

Methodist Discipline on changing rites, 316.

Mosaic law required immersions, 92–94.

Much water, 170–177.

Naaman dipping himself in Jordan, 86–88

Naaman shows what *wash* means in the Old Testament, 86.
Nebuchadnezzar not *baptized* with dew, 78.
Negro and Dr. W., 135.
Neo-Cæsarea, Council prohibited clinics from being presbyters, 23.
Noah and the Ark, 303.
Origin of pouring and sprinkling, 305–321.
Paul immersed, 274.
Paying a debt, the three bills, 16.
Pedobaptist fallacies, 32–35.
Witnesses on the meaning of the word baptizo, 36–60.
Ministers and Churches, how regarded by Baptists, 29, 30.
Synonyms. See *Synonyms.*
Misrepresentations of the case of Judith, 89, 90.
Pedobaptists wrongfully accuse us, 9.
Preach on baptism more than Baptists, 11.
Do not say *baptizo* means to *pour* or *sprinkle*, 31.
Contradict each other. Drs. Fairchild, Hibbard, and Rice, 97, 98. Cooke and Towne, Dr. Peters, Hibbard, and Slicer, 239.
Frequently contradict the Bible in advocating sprinkling, 87. Dr. Peters, (Luke xvi. 16,) 160. McLeod, (John iii. 23,) 170. Hibbard, (John iii. 32,) 175. Dr. Peters and Hibbard, (Matt. xxi. 27,) 196, 197. Peters, (Exodus xiv. 22; xv. 8,) 238. Wesley, (John v. 2–4; 2 Kings xviii. 17, &c.,) 252. Peters, (same passages as Wesley,) 252. Hibbard, (same,) 253. McLeod, (2 Chronicles xxxii. 4,) 256. (Also, Acts ii. 47,) 256, 257. Hibbard, (Acts xvi. 33, 34,) 284.
Pentecost, baptisms, 244–259.
Pilgrims to the Jordan immerse themselves in it, 195.

Pope Stephen permitted sprinkling in case of necessity, (A. D. 753,) 26.
Pouring an abridgment of the *divine* ordinance, 22.
Introduced for the sick, 23, 313.
Of the Spirit is not the *baptism* any more than *falling*, *breathing*, *anointing*, &c., 225–227.
Origin of, 305–321.
Presbyterian Board of Publication issue unjust accusations against us, 10.
Purifying is not baptism, 137–140.
Queer meanings, 135, 261.
Reasons for practicing immersion only, 322–328.
Rebaptism at Ephesus, 164.
Regeneration should precede baptism, 10, 12.
Dr. Rice's General Argument, 18. His two conclusions, 28, 29.
Dr. Rice, (See *Index of Authors.*)
Sacred sense of *baptizo* same as the classical, 79–84.
Scriptures contradicted by Pedobaptists. See *Pedobaptists.*
Sea-weed baptized, 72. Ships, 71.
Septuagint version, how and when made, 85.
Uses of *baptizo* in. See *Baptizo.*
Gives Isa. lii. 15, So shall he *astonish* many nations, 270, 271.
Spirit *poured*, immersion the *consequence* not the *act* of pouring, 224.
Water, and blood, 299.
Spirituality of religion no reason for neglecting baptism, 11,12.
Sprinkling introduced for the sick, 22.
First law for, 26, 27.
Introduced into Scotland in 1559. Afterwards into England, 26, 27. Not pronounced equal with immersion until 1311, 27.
Origin of, 305–321.
With a bush or instrument, 183.

Sprinkling of the Israelites in the Red Sea, absurdity of, 236–244.
Sprinkle many nations, *astonish* many nations, 270–273.
Suffering, Baptism of, 231–235.
Synonyms, Pedobaptist specimens of, 34, 100, 227, note.
Tables, baptism of, 286, 292–295.
Taylor's synonyms, absurdity of, 227, note.
Time plenty to immerse three thousand at Pentecost, 245.
Translations of the Bible sustain our views, 121–131.
Dr. Rice on the Peshito Syriac and German versions refuted, 125–131.
Union desirable and practicable, 15–17.
Views of Baptists stated, 14.
Wash, as a meaning of *baptizo*, always by immersion, 32, 48.
Water abundant in Jerusalem, 246.
For immersing the eunuch, 267–269.
For immersing Paul, 277.
Who shall forbid. Baptism of Cornelius, 280, 281.
Spirit, and blood, 299.
Witnesses, Spirit, water, and blood, 300.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS.

Aggelos, angel, 80.
Anastas, arose, 276, 277.
Apo, from out of, 187, 188.
Baptisma, immersion, 39.
Baptismos, immersion, 41, 43, 288.
Baptizo, (see General Index.)
Bapto, to dip, color, 62, 65, 67, 77, 78.
Cheo, to pour, 80.
Chiera, hand, 75.
Duno, to sink, 80.
Dikiosune, righteousness, 82.
Egkainizo, to dedicate, 80.
Eis, into, in, 74, 168, 188, 261–264.
Ek, out of, 168, 188, 264, 265.
En, in, 168–170.
Epi, at, in, 96, 97.
Haima, blood, 75.
Hudor, water, 169, 261.
Kathairo, Katharizo, } to purify, 80.
Lóuo, to wash, 80.
Loutro, a washing, 101–103.
Nipto, to wash hands, 80, 287
Ouranos, heaven, 82.
Pharanx, valley, 89, 91.
Pistis, faith, 82.
Pneuma, spirit, 80, 169.
Polla hudata, much water, 170–174.
Pur, fire, 169.
Raino, Rantizo, } to sprinkle, 80.
Sarx, flesh, 82.
Theos, God, 82.

CLASSICAL INDEX.

Achilles, Tatius, 138.
Ambrose, 112, 139.
Apostolical Canons, 119, 207.
Aratus, 62.
Aristophanes, 62, 65.
Aristotle, 62, 64, 67, 72.
Athanasius, 110, 207.
Augustine, 119, 209.
Barnabas, 106, 144.
Basil, 114, 138, 207.
Callimachus, 64.
Chrysostom, 68, 117, 139, 206.
Clement, Alex., 68, 108, 111, 138, 208.
Cornelius, 110.
Council of Toledo, 208.
Cyril of Jerusalem, 113, 206, 222, 258.
Cyril of Alexandria, 119.
Cyprian, 22, 23, 50, 109, 142, 306.
Damascenus, John, 207.
Diodorus Siculus, 66, 68, 71, 137.
Dionysius Areopagus, 208.
Dionysius Halicarnassus, 63, 65.
Epictetus, 66.
Eschylus, 65.
Euripides, 63, 64.

Eusebius, (Stroth's,) 174, 314.
Evenus, 67, 137.
Gelasius, 208.
Gregory Nazianzus, 112, 207.
Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea, 112.
Heliodorus, 67, 117, 137.
Heraclides Ponticus, 66.
Hermes, 106.
Herodotus, 62.
Hermolaus, 64.
Hippocrates, 63, 66, 71, 73, 137.
Hippolytus, 108.
Homer, 62, 75, 77.
Jerome, 86, 112, 149, 175.
Josephus, 66, 68, 71, 74, 104, 105, 138, 248, 250.
Justin Martyr, 68, 106, 138, 208.
Lycophron, 63, 64.
Lucian, 66.
Nicander, 64.
Origen, 109, 138.
Pelagius, 208.
Philo Judeus, 68, 106.
Philippus, 63.
Photius, 208.
Pindar, 65.
Plato, 63.
Plutarch, 63, 66, 68, 75, 138.
Polybius, 66.
Proclus, 138.
Sophocles, 63, 65.
Strabo, 66, 71.
Tertullian, 107.
Theocritus, 63.
Theodoret, 208.
Theophilact, 214, 223.
Xenophon, 62.

INDEX OF AUTHORS QUOTED OR REFERRED TO.

Alstedius, 46, 149.
Altingius, 50.
Altmannus, 154.
Am. Encyclopedia, 46, 157.
Anthon, 33, 42.
Arnold, 240.
Ash, 47.
Augusti, 56.
Auscher, 46.
Bailey, 47.
Barclay, 267.
Barnes, 215.
Baronius, 24, 313.
Barrow, 58.
Basnage, 310.
Bass, 41.
Baxter, 205.
Beausobre, 156.
Beckmannus, 59.
Beecher, 137.
Bengellius, 209.
Benedict, 183.
Bently, 59.
Beza, 49, 126.
Bingham, 150, 212.
Bloomfield, 55, 211, 222, 233
Bourdeaux Pilgrim, 248, 281
Bossuet, 50, 145.
Bowers, 152.
Boys, 216.
Braunus, 216.
Bretschneider, 38.
Brenner, 56.
Bucanus, 59.
Buddeus, 51.
Bunsen, 109, 153.

Burkhardt, 175.
Burkitt, 203.
Burmannus, 59, 154, 215.
Burnett, 216, 318.
Butterworth, 47.
Buxtorf, 46, 126, 291.
Cajetan, 217.
Calvin, 26, 55, 146, 150, 272, 308.
Calmet, 292.
Campbell, Geo., 52, 144, 169, 197, 221.
Carson, 61, 172.
Casaubon, 57, 146, 224.
Castellio, 42, 156.
Cattenburgh, 51.
Cave, 148, 217.
Chalmers, 55, 143, 206.
Chambers' Cyclopedia, 149.
Chamierius, 318.
Cheyne, 318.
Christopulos, 57.
Clarke and Lightfoot, 94, 152, 177.
Clarke, Adam, 211.
Clarke, Samuel, 203.
Coleman, 58.
Conant, 61, 69, 70.
Confession of Helvetia, 149.
Congregational Magazine, 171.
Conybeare and Howson, 204.
Cooke and Towne, 178, 192, 239, 254, 278, 284.
Constantin, 43.
Council of Toledo, 208.
Cranmer, 208.
Curcellius, 53, 150.
Cyprian, 22, 23, 50, 109, 142.
Daille, 157.
Dale, 175.
Davenant, 218.
Dermont, 155.
Deylingius, 155.
Dionysius Petavius, 317.
Doddridge, 177, 197, 210, 232, 272.
Donnegan, 40, 89.
Du Fresne, 314.
Dupin, 156.
Edinburgh Encyclopedia, 26, 46, 309.
Edinburgh Reviewers, 58, 211.
Edwards, John, 211.
Encyclopedia Britannica, 310.
Encyclop'a Ecclesiastica, 143.
Encyclop'a Rel. Kn., 94, 277, 290.
Encyclop'a, Am., New, 311.
Estius, 155, 216.
Eusebius, 174, 247
Fabricius, 46, 126.
Fairchild, 10, 90, 97, 99, 104, 171, 178, 187, 255, 265, 267, 276, 294, 300.
Fell, 218.
Flatt and Storrs, 53, 152.
Floyer, Sir John, 57, 318.
Formey, 317.
Frankius, 213.
Fritsche, 51, 291, 312.
Geiseler, 22, 314.
Genthe, 129.
Gesenius, 158, 270.
Goodwin, 210.
Gregory, 149.
Grotius, 146, 151, 316.
Groves, 38.
Gurney, 153.
Gurtlerus, 51, 222, 229.
Guyse, 183.
Hall, E., 257, 296.
Hamelius, 318.
Hammond, 204.
Hahn, 157.
Hay, 239, 256.
Hedericus, 37.

Heidanus, 155.
Heinsius, 128.
Helvetia Confession, 149.
Hervey, 233.
Hibbard, 91, 97, 98, 159, 171, 178, 179, 189, 190, 192, 196, 239, 253, 267, 276, 277, 280, 295.
Hoadley, 204.
Hopkins, 224.
Horne's Introd., 98, 265, 278, 293.
Horne, Bp., 242.
Hospinianus, 50.
Ikenius, 57, 223, 229.
Jaspis, 213.
Jeremiah, 52.
Jerome, 149, 175.
Johnson, Samuel, 316.
Jones, 40.
Jortin, 215.
Jurien, 146.
Judson, 283.
Jahn, 280, 293.
Kaltschmidt, 129.
Keckermannus, 51, 149.
Kitto's Cyclopedia, 46, 292.
King, 156.
Knapp, 22, 54, 110, 129, 142, 219, 306.
Kuinoel, 177, 291.
Lange, 214.
Latin Vulgate, 96.
Le Clerc, 154, 224.
Leigh, 42.
Leighton, 212, 271, 304.
Leo, 214.
Liddell and Scott, 41.
Lightfoot and Clarke, 94, 152, 177.
Lightfoot, 291.
Liturgy, Ch. of Eng., 317.
Limborch, 57.
Locke, 218.
London Quar. Review, 53.
Lowman, 240.
Lowth, 240.
Luther, 53, 127, 146, 152, 204.
Lynch, 176, 195.
Macknight, 197, 201, 303.
Magdeburg Centuriators, 149
Maimonides, 93, 102, 288.
Manton, 209.
Martyr, Peter, 215.
Mastricht, 148.
Matthies, 212, 316.
M'Leod, 168, 170, 257.
Mede, 154.
Melancthon, 58, 146.
Methodist Discipline, 316.
Meyer, 158, 290.
Michælis, 45, 126.
Mintert, 43.
Monks of Cressey, 26, 310.
Morus, 149.
Mosheim, 19, 20, 147, 148.
Neander, 49, 158, 223, 313.
Neo-Cæsarea, Council, 22, 24
Newton, R. 205.
Nicholson, 209.
Nismes, Council, 308.
Olshausen, 177, 203, 291.
Otto Von Gerlach, 59, 158.
Orchard's Hist., 278.
Owen, 304.
Parkhurst, 38.
Pasor, 40.
Passow, 42.
Patrick, 240.
Paullus, 56.
Penn, 153.
Peters, 79, 80, 160, 164, 178, 183, 196, 238, 252, 267, 276, 295.
Pickering, 41.

Pictet, 56, 143.
Picteus, 209.
Piscator, 154.
Poole, 233.
Poole's Continuators, 57.
Pope, Alex., 75.
Pope, Stephen, 26, 310.
Polhill, 197.
Porson, 51.
Presbyterian Bd. Pub., 10, 56, 143.
Quenstedt, 218.
Ravenna, Council, 26, 308, 309.
Rees' Cyclopedia, 157.
Reeves, 107.
Reynolds, 223.
Rheinwald, 313.
Rheinhardt, 216.
Ridgeley, 57.
Rice, 12, 19, 22, 28, 29, 71, 72, 75, 77, 81, 91, 95, 100, 101, 115, 125, 126, 130, 254, 273, 276.
Richardson, 42.
Robertson, 41.
Robinson, 38, 169, 220, 229, 233, 247, 268.
Rogers, 52.
Rost, 40.
Rosenmuller, 213, 291.
Salmasius, 56, 151, 312.
Salmon, Rabbi, 289.
Samson, 250, 268.
Saurin, 212.
Scaliger, 292.
Scapula, 37.
Schaaf, 45, 125, 156.
Schindler, 46.
Schœtgenius, 43.
Schleusner, 32, 38.
Schneckenberger, 289.
Scholz, 57.
Schrivellius, 38.
Schwenck, 129.
Scudder, 208.
Secker, 203.
Septuagint, 85, 269, 270.
Sherlock, 212.
Slicer, 239.
Smith, Bp., 147, 205, 316.
Smitthenner, 129.
Spencer, 195.
Spencer, 289.
Stackhouse, 146.
Starcke, 218, 290.
Stephanus, 32, 38.
Stillingfleet, 309.
Stokius, 41.
Storr and Flatt, 53, 152, 204, 316.
Stourdza, 52.
Stovel, 107.
Stroth, 314.
Stuart, 24, 55, 61, 62, 63–67, 77, 81, 83, 103, 108, 119, 139, 153, 174, 199, 223, 229, 234, 242, 311.
Suicerus, 41, 212.
Suidas, 39.
Superville, 215.
Taylor, Bp., 154.
Taylor, C., 227.
Theophilact, 214, 223.
Tholuck, 214.
Tillotson, 202, 222.
Toledo, Council, 208.
Towerson, 150, 177.
Towne and Cooke, 178, 192, 239, 254, 278, 284.
Trelawney, Sir H., 233.
Trommius, 43.
Turretin, 213, 316.
Tyndale, 206.
Valesius, 23, 58, 313.
Vartabed, 46.
Vatablus, 290.

Venema, 21, 51, 307, 308.
Vitringa, 55, 151.
Von Gerlach, 59.
Von Coln, 314.
Vossius, 151.
Wahl, 39.
Wall, 144, 202, 314.
Warburton, 212.
Watson, 170, 239.
Webster, 32.
Weigand, 129.
Wells, 210.
Wesley, 114, 202, 233, 252, 294.
Westminster Assembly, 205.
Wetham, 317.
Wetstenius, 58, 291.
Whitby, 146, 210, 238, 240.
Whitefield, 202.
Wilson, 46.
Winer, 214, 314.
Witsius, 55, 93, 197, 232, 237.
Wolfius, 149.
Ypeij, 155.
Young, 47.
Zanchius, 55, 155.

INDEX OF TEXTS QUOTED OR ILLUSTRATED.

GENESIS.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
xiii.	10,	171
xxviii.	18,	132
xliii.	31–33,	293
xlv.	22,	266

EXODUS.

ix.	10,	133
ix.	33,	132
xiv.	22,	238
xiv.	15–31,	236
xiv.	24, 25,	241
xv.	8,	238
xx.	16,	11
xxix.	4,	192

LEVITICUS.

vi.	28,	94, 287
viii.		192, 193
xi.	32,	92, 287
xiv.	2, 3,	87
xiv.	8,	92, 99
xiv.	41,	132
xv.	5,	94, 288
xv.	8,	99
xv.	21,	288
xvii.	15, 16,	94, 99, 288

NUMBERS.

viii.	6, 7,	193
xix.	16–19,	102
xxxi.	23,	94, 288

DEUTERONOMY.

viii.	7,	171

I. KINGS.

xviii.	33–35,	115

II. KINGS.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
v.	5,	266
v.	12,	277
v.	14,	86
xviii.	17,	248
xx.	20,	249

II. CHRONICLES.

xxxii.	3, 4, 30,	249

NEHEMIAH.

ii.	14,	247

JOB.

ii.	12,	133
ix.	31,	103
xxvii.	16,	266

PSALMS.

xviii.	16,	232
xxxii.	6,	232
xlii.	6, 7,	231
xlvi.	6, 7,	115
lxii.	8,	133
lxviii.	3,	103
lxviii.	7, 8, 9,	241
lxix.	2,	103, 115
lxix.	2, 14, 15,	232
lxxvii.	16–18,	240
lxxvii.	19,	173
lxxix.	6,	133
lxxxviii.	7,	232
xciii.	4,	173
cxxiv.	4, 5,	232

ECCLESIASTES.

ii.	6,	248

SONG OF SOLOMON.

iii.	6,	188

ISAIAH.

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
vii.	3,	248
xxi.	4,	102
xxii.	11,	248
lii.	14, 15,	270
liii.	3,	180
lxiii.	11,	227

LAMENTATIONS.

iii.	54,	232

EZEKIEL.

xxxii.	14,	232
xxxvi.	35,	133

DANIEL.

iv.	25, 33,	78

JOEL.

ii.	28,	133

MATTHEW.

iii.	1,	154
iii.	2,	156
iii.	1, 3, 6, 11, 16,	134,135,169
iii.	7,	182
iii.	5, 6, 9, 10,	166
iii.	10–12,	228
iii.	11,	169,220,226,228
iii.	13–16,	139
iii.	15,	191
iii.	13–17,	186, 188
iv.	18,	262
iv.	23,	162
v.	19,	320
vi.	19,	266, 268
viii.	32,	262
ix.	6,	292
xi.	5,	162
xi.	12, 13,	161

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
xii.	28,	161
xiii.	8,	96
xiii.	14–18,	96
xiii.	47,	262
xiv.	2,	184
xv.	3, 9,	9
xvii.	15,	262
xviii.	5,	96
xx.	22, 23,	231
xxi.	12, 23,	196
xxii.	9,	96
xxiv.	30,	96
xxvi.	7,	133
xxvi.	26,	33
xxvii.	43,	96
xxviii.	19,	8
	MARK.	
..	1–4,	161
i.	5,	135
i.	5, 9,	263
i.	8,	221
i.	9,	188
i.	9–11,	186
i.	14, 15,	161
v.	13,	263
ix.	22,	263
ix.	42,	263
xvi.	15,	8
	LUKE.	
i.	15,	163, 227
ii.	4,	188
iii.	16,	221
iii.	21, 22,	187
iv.	43,	162
vii.	30,	182
viii.	31,	263
ix.	2, 6,	162
x.	1,	245
xi.	20,	161
xii.	50,	134, 135, 139, 231, 235
xvi.	16,	160
xvii.	2,	263
xviii.	38,	291
xxiv.	52, 53,	246
	JOHN.	
i.	11,	189
i.	28,	168
i.	29–34,	187
i.	33,	221
ii.	15,	133
iii.	23,	134, 139, 170
iii.	32,	180
iv.	1,	179
v.	2–4,	246
v.	7,	263
v.	8,	292
ix.	7,	247
xi.	55,	188
xiv.	15,	12, 321
xiv.	21,	320
xv.	14,	12, 60, 321
xvi.	15,	191
xx.	22,	226
xxi.	7,	263
	ACTS.	
i.	5,	221, 223
i.	15,	181
i.	26,	245
ii.	1–4,	221
ii.	2,	233
ii.	9–11,	181
ii.	15,	246
ii.	37, 38,	244
ii.	43,	251
ii.	46, 47,	245, 246
vi.	7,	251
viii.	8, 5, 25, 27, 40,	262
viii.	18,	118

Chapter.	Verse.	Page.
viii.	27,	265
viii.	32,	272
viii.	36–39,	260
viii.	38,	26
ix.	6, 11, 18, 34, 39,40.	276, 277
ix.	18,	27, 274
x.	38,	226
x.	13, 20,	277
x.	44,	226
x.	47, 48,	280
xi.	27,	163
xi.	2, 3,	281
xiii.	1,	163
xv.	32,	163
xvi.	13, 24–34,	282, 283
xix.	1–5,	164, 180
xix.	4,	163
xix.	6,	226
xx.	23,	266
xxii.	11, 16,	275
xxvii.	38,	263

ROMANS.

vi.	4,	134, 139, 146, 198–217
viii.	9,	223
x.	21,	180

I. CORINTHIANS.

x.	1, 2,	236
xi.	4,	162

GALATIANS.

iii.	27,	139
v.	16, 17,	223

EPHESIANS.

iv.	3–6,	299

COLOSSIANS.

ii.	12,	134, 198–217

I. THESSALONIANS.

v.	20,	163

TITUS.

iii.	6,	226

HEBREWS.

vii.	11, 12, 14,	194
ix.	13,	133
ix.	10,	287

JAMES.

v.	2,	266

I. PETER.

iii.	20, 21,	303
iv.	14,	227

I. JOHN.

i.	3–5,	321
v.	8,	300

REVELATION.

i.	10,	222
i.	15,	172
iv.	2,	223
viii.	8,	263
ix.	13,	78
xiv.	2,	173
xvii.	1,	173
xvii.	3,	263
xviii.	21,	263
xix.	6,	173
xxi.	7,	263

APOCRYPHA.

JUDITH.

xii.	7,	88

ECCLESIASTICUS OR SIRACH.

xxxi. xxxiv	25, 30, 25.	100

DATE DUE

SEP 2 9 1980

NOV 1 0 1982

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

265.16
B154

Bailey, Gilbert Stephen

AUTHOR

A manual of baptism

265.16
B154 Bailey, Gilbert Stephen
A manual of baptism

68107